DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 272	VT 010 586

AUTHOR	Mabry, James E.; And Others
TITLE	A Review of Pre-Release Programs. Criminal Justice Monograph Vol. I. No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Coll., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	115p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Rehabilitation, *Corrective Institutions, *Experimental Programs, Literature Reviews, *Prisoners, Probationary Period, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	*Recidivism

ABSTRACT

The most serious problem confronting correctional institutions is recidivism, the proneness of many criminals to continue a life of crime. A recent study estimated that 30 to 75 percent of the offenders leaving prison would return within 5 years. Data were collected by a literature review, correspondence with administrators of prerelease programs, and questionnaires distributed to state and federal correctional institutions. Information on a variety of experimental programs was collected. One was the work-release concept which allows the inmate to be employed in a nearby community and return to the institution at night. Furloughs permit prisoners to visit a designated place or places for a period not to exceed 30 days and return to the institution at the end of that period, and half-way houses provide a place to live and other types of assistance to ex-inmates immediately after their release from prison. Other types of experimental programs are open institutions, reception center parole, and intensive community treatment. A bibliography, sample questionnaire, and list of institutions with prerelease programs are appended. (BC)

ED0 40272

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Vol. I, No. 2
1969

A Review of Pre-Release Programs

James E. Mabry, M.A.
Charles M. Friel, Ph.D.
Donald J. Weisenhorn, M.S.W.
Dorothy D. Hayes, Ph.D., L.L.B.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE COLLEGE
Huntsville, Texas

VT 010 586

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION.................................... 1

The Problem.................................... 1

Methods of Investigation.................................... 5

Purpose of the Study.................................... 7

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.................................... 10

The Institutional Setting.................................... 11

Historical Development of Resocialization.................................... 18

Alternative to Confinement.................................... 22

Circumstances and Problems of Release.................................... 24

Era of Experimentation.................................... 29

Concept and Philosophy of Pre-Release.................................... 41

III. RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.................................... 53

Responses from Institutions.................................... 54

Comments of Administrators.................................... 72

Analysis of the Data.................................... 74

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.................................... 83

Summary.................................... 83

Conclusions.................................... 88

BIBLIOGRAPHY.................................... 92

PAGE

APPENDIX A. Sample Questionnaire........................ 97

APPENDIX B. Institutions with Pre-Release............... 103

APPENDIX C. Established Dates of Pre-Release............ 105

APPENDIX D. Institutions without Pre-Release............ 107

APPENDIX E. Institutions not Responding................. 109

VITA.. 111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Number and Percentages of Institutions Who Replied to the Questionnaire........................ 55

II. Frequency Distribution of Operational Time as of August, 1968................................ 57

III. Average Number of Participants per Program................ 59

IV. Criteria Used for Selection of Participants by Yes-No Responses.................................. 60

V. Average Length of Program Session.......................... 61

VI. Total Number of Participants Who Have Completed the Program as of August, 1968............... 62

VII. Responses to Use of Ancillary Programs..................... 64

VIII. Distribution of Responses to Program Goals................. 66

IX. Distribution of Responses to Type of Administrators.. 67

X. Number of Staff Members Classified as Professional or Custodial............................ 68

XI. Frequency Distribution of Responses concerning Staff Membership............................ 70

XII. Responses to Criteria Used in Staff Selection.. 71

TABLE PAGE

XIII. Frequency Distribution of Responses to Criteria Used to Evaluate Program Success................. 77
XIV. Recidivism Rates prior to Pre-Release and after Pre-Release Established............................. 79
XV. Institutions Reporting Reduction in Recidivism after Establishing Pre-Release................. 80
XVI. Frequency Distribution of Responses to Individual Program Evaluation............................. 81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary society seemingly has a variety of objectives in regard to control of crime, and it considers imprisonment the means for attaining each of them. The functions of the prisons in America can be summarized in the following statements: First, society wants protection from criminals. The prison isolates criminals from general society so they cannot commit crimes during the certain periods of time. Second, society wants retribution. The prison is expected to make life unpleasant. Third, society wants to reduce crime rates not only by reforming criminals but also by deterring the general public from behavior which is punishable by imprisonment. Finally, as implied by the relatively recent emphasis on reform, rehabilation, and treatment of criminals, society wants criminals changed. The prison is expected to "reform" or rehabilitate criminals.

Prison management probably more than any other aspect of public administration has been curtailed by legal restrictions or public opinion in the freedom of experimentation in methods of treating its charges. In the coming years, efforts should be made by correctional workers to try out new devices and procedures for rehabilitation of inmates. One fruitful area for research lies in the discovery of practical measures for helping inmates make a successful transition to family and community life after release from prison.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The most serious problem confronting corrections is that of recidivism, the proneness of many criminals to continue a life of crime. A recidivist may be defined as a person who, having been convicted and subject to correctional treatment, again commits a crime and returns to confinement. The core problem is persistency in criminal behavior.[1]

One recent study has revealed that 30 to 75 per cent of the offenders leaving prison will return within five years.[2] A few institutions claim a lower rate of recidivism. However, generally, the recidivism rates are cited as evidence of the failure of institutionalized corrections. This assumption merits examination.

A perplexing situation in the treatment of prison inmates occurs when men are under custodial supervision in the institution on one day and on the following day leave prison to comparative freedom in the community. It is generally recognized that many recidivists return to prison merely because they were not adequately prepared to face the free and normal society. A somewhat similar situation would prevail were disturbed patients of a mental hospital released directly to the community because of the expiration of a period of commitment. Dr. Norman Fenton, formerly chief of the Classification Bureau of the Department of Corrections for California, points out the importance of preparing the man for release. "The prison has institutionalized him; thus he must be de-institutionalized."[3]

---

[1] Sol Rubin, "Recidivism and Recidivism Statistics," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, (July, 1958), p. 233.

[2] Harry E. Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (Englewood Cliff, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 58.

[3] Norman Fenton, "The Psychological Preparation of Inmates for Release," Prison World (November-December, 1949), p. 9.

Repeated crime is judged, regardless of the nature of the crimes, as total failure of any treatment. Beck argues that "success" or "failure" in treatment of criminals should be defined more specifically. Why did the offender resume his criminality? Statistics would show whether the new crimes stemmed from new problems which arose after release from treatment or whether they reflected failure to solve the particular problem which stimulated the earlier crime.[4] This differentiation would bring us closer to determining whether a failure of treatment was involved. On the other hand, non-recidivism is not proof of treatment success. The prisoner may have adjusted through his own effort or because of other factors unrelated to the correctional program. Perhaps he became rehabilitated in spite of the program.

It is estimated that 95 per cent of the inmates of our prisons and reformatories return to society, the majority of them within two or three years.[5] It must be clear, therefore, that society should do everything within its power to make our correctional institutions effective agencies or rehabilitation. At present, correctional institutions are making intensive and concentrated efforts to prepare the offender for his reentry into society in an attempt to reduce the rate of recidivism.

It had been known for a long time that the highest percentage of post-release failures occur within six months after release, with the greatest number taking place during the first 60 days.[6] But it was not until recently that penal and correctional institutions realized that something must be done to help inmates bridge the gap between the prison community and life in free society. Much experimentation followed in attempts to formulate workable procedures to help prepare prisoners for their return to the community. The concept of pre-release preparation was thus added to the machinery of corrections.

---

[4] C. J. Beck, "A Reconsideration of Labels in Penology," _A Review of General Semantics_, (Autumn, 1959), p. 84.

[5] _Task Force Report on Corrections_, A Report Prepared by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 179.

Pre-release is that portion of incarceration prior to release either by discharge or parole in which an intensive and concentrated effort is made by the institution to help the prisoner prepare for his reentry into free society. From this effort evolved three principles now recognized as essential in establishing a realistic program of pre-release preparation. It is the purpose of pre-release (1) to make available to prisoners information and assistance deemed pertinent in release planning; (2) to provide each prisoner the opportunity, in a non-threatening situation, to discuss problems and anxieties relating to his release and future social adjustment; and (3) to provide a system of evaluating the effectiveness of release planning procedures.

Since new programs have considerable impact on the correctional organization in which they occur, research is needed to identify what the effects are so that change can be managed more efficiently. The problem for this thesis is to explore the existing programs of pre-release and determine the effectiveness in terms of reduced recidivism rates and evaluation of the program design.

---

[6] J. E. Baker, "Preparing Prisoners for Their Return to the Community," Federal Probation (June, 1966), p. 43.

Importance of the study. Society needs to be made aware of its part in the creation and perpetuation of some of the basic causes of recidivism and of the great cost to itself resulting from neglect of the problem. Correctional workers themselves are in need of more enlightenment on the subject of pre-release. Research, the kind intended for this study, may help to convince hesitant correctional personnel of the fact that correctional principles, values, and techniques can be utilized effectively in a setting of authority which also employs the concept of pre-release.

II. METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

The following methods were used to obtain information for this study (1) review of the published materials available through library resources. These materials included books, articles, related papers presented in professional journals, and the reports of various conferences and committees on pre-release; (2) through correspondence with administrators of existing programs of pre-release; (3) material received from recognized authorities in the field of corrections; (4) data secured from a questionnaire sent to all state and various federal correctional institutions; and (5) a primary source was my own experience with a pre-release program while working at the Ferguson Unit, Texas Department of Correction, as educational director since November, 1965.

Library sources. Studies in the area of pre-release have been reported in widely scattered governmental reports, professional journals, and the publication of various private agencies and organizations. A purpose of this study was to assemble some of these fugitive materials from existent literature and present a springboard for future research. This knowledge was sought from pertinent publications such as the American Journal of Correction, published by the American Correctional Association, Federal Probation, published by the United States Probation Service, Manual of Correctional Standards, Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Pacific Sociological Review, Annals 293, Trans-Action, Prison Journal, Prison World, Handbook on Pre-Release Preparation in Correctional Institutions and National Conference on Pre-Release. In addition, various books and articles by leading criminologists and correctional authorities afforded much assistance. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice revealed their research findings in a number of volumes which provided essential information for this study.

Correspondence with Pre-Release Administrators. Over a three-month period the investigator corresponded with various administrators of existing pre-release programs. This procedure was deemed necessary in order to gain additional background material for this study. The response from correspondence was very rewarding and additional approach avenues were revealed. Information for this study would have been limited without the additional material and references received through correspondence with the various program administrators.

Recognized authorities. The National Conference on Pre-Release was held at the Lowman Student Center, Sam Houston State College, Huntsville, Texas, on November 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1967. Participation in this symposium was both educational and rewarding. Each participant provided material describing the various approaches used by individual states.

The writer spent much time talking to representatives from the various states, learning the different approaches, hearing of trial and errors, listening to criticism and advantages and generally absorbing progressive ideas connected with the pre-release concept. During the Conference, recognized authorities discussed the problems of pre-release and need for evaluation research; thus the idea for this study was born.

The Questionnaire. The use of a questionnaire was a necessity. The information requested on the questionnaire was developed through all the combined methods of research. Through research and correspondence, always certain areas and questions seemed to be left unanswered; these questions appear on the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was sent to all state and various federal correctional institutions. In addition, information was obtained from military installations serving a similar purpose. The data collected from the questionnaire are reported in Chapter III of this study.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

One characteristic of correctional research is that so many of its projects are conducted as though no research had been done before them, or as though the researcher was ignorant of previous study done in the field. The only contribution that much correctional research makes is a confirmation of an earlier project. At the present time, perhaps what is needed in addition to surveys of the field variety is an investigation and analysis of the work that has already been done. This would constitute a point of departure for future research.

This study was undertaken on the assumption that corrections is losing much valuable material and information by not operating research evaluation programs at the same time that a new idea is put into practice. If research is to offer fresh food for thought, ongoing programs must be evaluated. Until the effects of imprisonment itself are evaluated, we will not be able realistically to assess the effect of other methods of rehabilitation which might be used in conjunction with incarceration.

Another assumption upon which this study rests is the most basic and the one around which the whole concept of pre-release revolves. The prisoner needs help in bridging the gap between prison and the free society. To turn him loose without proper preparation for what faces him, or to fail to give him guidance after he leaves, is manifestly unfair.

The final assumption upon which the study will rest is that society does have an obligation, and the right, to intervene in the private lives of its individual members for the purpose of protecting the community. It follows that the correctional agency, to which society delegates this responsibility, also has the obligation and responsibility to create and design programs for preparing the offender for his reentry into the community.

The purpose for this study is to explore and evaluate the pre-release program. To determine the effectiveness, in terms of reduced recidivism rates and program content, the basic questions to be answered were:

1. Are these programs set up in such a way as to evaluate which parts of the program have the greatest effect on bringing about the desired behavioral changes? Are the behaviors to be effected by the program actually measurable?

2. What are the selection criteria used to determine who participates? What are the criteria used in selection of personnel who staff the program?

3. What are the defined goals or objectives of the pre-release program? What specifically should be accomplished in the program?

4. What criteria are used to evaluate the success of individual programs? Is pre-release accomplishing its intended purpose?

5. What evaluations and recommendations can be made from an examination of existing programs?

The remaining chapters in this thesis contain the historical development of pre-release and its justification for existence. A review of the literature concerning principles, philosophy and development of the pre-release concept is given in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written in regard to the purpose of prisons, the incidence and causes of recidivism, and of programs designed to prepare the prisoner for his return to society. Generally, our prison systems have been slow to change or accept new ideas. Even our modern prison system is proceeding on a rather uncertain course because its administration is necessarily a series of compromises. In fact, Bennett says:

> On the one hand, prisons are expected to punish; on the other, they are suppose to reform. They are expected to discipline rigorously at the same time that they teach self-reliance. They are built to be operated like vast impersonal machines, yet they are expected to fix men to live normal community lives. They operate in accordance with a fixed autocratic routine, yet they are expected to develop individual initiative. All too frequently restrictive law force prisoners into idleness despite the fact that one of their primary objectives is to teach men how to earn an honest living. They refuse a prisoner a voice in self-government, but they expect him to become a thinking citizen in a democratic society. To some, prisons are nothing but "country clubs" catering to the whims and fancies of the inmates. To others, the prison atmosphere seems changed only with bitterness, rancor and an all-pervading sense of defeat. And so the whole paradoxical scheme continues, because our ideas and views regarding the function of correctional institutions in our society are confused, fuzzy, and nebulous.[1]

This chapter will serve as the background for the study. A review of the literature and research will explore the following aspects of the project: (1) the institutional setting and its effects on the offender; (2) the historical development of reform and resocialization; (3) the circumstances and problems of release; (4) the experimental programs dealing with the transitional period; and (5) the concept and philosophy of the pre-release program.

---

[1] James V. Bennett, Federal Prisons, 1948, A Report of the Work of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 3.

I. THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

To the visitor or new inmate, the world within prison gates is strange and forbidding. Walls, steel bars and guard towers dominate the scene in the traditional prison. Metal doors open and close with a clang reverberating down long corridors. Layers of paint and the odors of chemicals attest to the persistent struggle to maintain the dehumanized brand of sanitation characteristic of many domiciliary institutions. The mood of some prisons is one of hovering tension. Uniforms symbolize the sharp division of the population into a prisoner group and an employee group. The prison represents a community containing hundreds of persons thrown together for a sufficient number of years to create regularities in behavior.

The new prisoner finds the realities of prison life to be in sharp contrast with his evaluation of his place in the world. Confinement is an experience requiring major adjustments. In the last 300 years, imprisonment emerged as a humanitarian reaction against mass executions and brutal punishments. Long-term confinement of masses of convicted offenders was accepted as the major means of implementing the philosophy of punishment. The movement toward treatment has brought efforts to reduce the rigors of confinement and make it a therapeutic experience. However, confinement as a human experience remains a major factor in penology.

Critics contend that the prison itself militates against therapy. Clyde B. Vedders quotes from an editorial in the San Quentin News which described a prison as

> . . . a metropolis of men without women, a beehive without honey, caged loneliness without privacy, a ranch where all the sheep are black, a cement park with barbed wire shrubbery, and an enormous microscope, under which psychiatrists study a smear from civilization's ulcers.[2]

Another description of the institution is given by John Gillen, who says:

> What monuments of stupidity are these institutions we have built, stupidity not so much of the inmates as of free citizens. What a mockery of science are our prison discipline, our massing of social iniquity in prisons, the good and bad together in one stupendous potpouri. How silly of us to think that we can prepare men for social life by reversing the ordinary process of socialization, silence for the only animal with speech; repressive regimentation of men who are in prison because they need to learn how to exercise their activities in constructive ways; outward conformity to rules which repress all efforts at constructive expression; work without the operation of economic motives; motivation by fear of punishment rather than by hope of reward or appeal to their higher motives; cringing rather than growth in manliness; rewards secured by betrayal of a fellow inmate rather than the development of a loyalty.[3]

The ultimate objective of imprisonment is to reduce the future incidences of crimes. The general trend in our society is toward the therapeutic ideology. Since all prisons overtly accept treatment as a goal, the distinction between treatment-oriented and custody-oriented prisons is a matter of relative priority given general goals and relative depth of the interest in rehabilitation.

---

[2] Clyde B. Vedders, "Counter Force in Prison-Inmate Therapy," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, (November-December, 1954), p. 447.

[3] John Gillen, Taming the Criminal (New York: Macmillan, 1931), pp. 295-296.

Reformation is assumed to be induced by treatment, rather than by purposive infliction of pain. The conditions which led to an inmate's crimes are determined, and the inmates are then introduced to the psychological, social, educational, and technical skills which are considered important to their reformation. Efficient performance of this task depends on prison conditions which are conducive to rehabilitation and to helpful constructive action based on the inmate's individual needs.

Rehabilitation is a process aimed at moving the prisoner along a series of stages ranging from overt conflict with legal norms to assimilation with the ranks of the law-abiding population. Prisoners vary in their position on this continuum when they enter the correctional institution. They differ in their capacity and willingness to participate in the rehabilitation process. Institutions differ in the resources available to move the inmate along the continuum. All prisons have the responsibility for achieving through managerial efficiency the general goals of social protection and treatment. However, there is a wide variation among prisons in the relative priority given each of these goals.

Social protection as a goal emphasizes safeguarding the public from crime and the criminal. This goal has been sought through punishment, treatment, and temporary restraint of the inmate. Punishment as an end in itself seldom is advocated openly now in prison circles.

Under the concept of deterrence and retribution, punishment is rationalized as a means of inmate rehabilitation, thereby eliminating a portion of the threat to society.

The goal of treatment in prison is that the offender be exposed to experiences which will eradicate, or at least reduce measurably, the influence of causal factors behind his criminal behavior. It is intended that he be restored to the community better prepared to meet his own material and social needs within the framework of legal norms. The fundamental principles of treatment can be briefly summarized. First, the offender is to be convinced that a hostile human environment is not solely responsible for his difficulties. Somehow he must be brought to the realization that his own motives and patterns of perception have influenced his experiences with others. Second, the frequency and intensity of his frustrating experiences should be lowered sufficiently to enable him to bring them within his capacity for control. Third, his attention should be diverted away from futile efforts to change his environment drastically and toward the undertaking of changes within himself. This treatment strategy involves the acceptance by the inmate of a noncriminal value system in evaluating himself. Fourth, the inmate should be provided with experiences which will enable him to test his new modes of perceiving his environment and relating himself to the persons making up this environment.

Let us consider some of the realities in establishing and operating a prisoner rehabilitation program. Individualized treatment requires concern for interests of the offender and protection of society. Humane handling of deviants among prisoners is universally acknowledged as a desirable policy; but the custody orientation evaluates punishment and surveillance as necessary responses, because protection of the outside society through maintenance of order within the prison are given priority over the particular meaning of rule violations and consequent punishments to the prisoner.[4] If coercion is to be the means of deterring potential criminals, the prison should have a negative public image. If the rehabilitated offender is to be accepted into the community after release, the public image should be either neutral or positive.[5]

If confinement has the more restricted purpose of only restraining the prisoner without otherwise coping with his criminality, the principles of incapacitation and social sanitation are pertinent. The inmate is incapacitated in that during his stay behind bars he is unable to commit crimes in the free community. Social sanitation is accomplished by isolating the offender, thereby increasing the relative importance of noncriminal activity as behavior models in the free community. These purposes offer temporary social protection, but, in the long run, the experience of confinement may return the offender to the community with increased bitterness and greater criminal skills.[6] Ideally, the institution offers a variety of treatment programs sufficient to individualize treatment for most inmates and still meet the demands of managerial efficiency through effective use of staff and facilities.

---

[4] Donald R. Cressey, "Achievement of an Unstated Organizational Tool: An Observation on Prisons," Pacific Sociological Review, (Fall, 1948), pp. 44-45.

[5] John Galtung, "Prison: The Organization of Dilemma," in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison, (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1960), p. 122.

Although it is not yet clear what form the prisons of tomorrow will assume, some important developments have culminated during the years which seem to indicate the trend. Three alternative courses of action may be taken as remedies. First, strict control measures might be used to alter the prison as a social universe. A second course of action would be to eliminate the prison entirely and substitute a new form of institution patterned after a hospital. The third alternative would be to introduce within the existing prison system the same general principles and approach implied by Ralph S. Banay. He quotes a prison official, "our job is just to keep these people in." Banay suggests that society should be more interested in keeping people from "going in" in the first place or in preventing their "going back" after they have been in and have been released.[7]

The position has been taken throughout the prisons as we know them in our culture have failed in rehabilitation and, in fact, have been the instrument in hardening many of their prisoners in antisocial attitudes. Although society is not prepared to abolish the prison at this time, the swing will eventually be in that direction. It is a fact little known to moderns that it was a Roman jurist, Ulpian, living during the reign of Emperor Caracalla (A. D. 211-217), who protested against prisons as a place for punishment. Ulpian aptly expressed his complaint when he said, "Carcer ad continendos homines, non ad puniendos haberi debet--Prisons ought to be used for detention only, not for punishment."[8] In 1948, Professor Max Grunhut of Oxford University, after surveying the history of imprisonment as an attempt to deal with the offender, stated, "After more than 150 years of prison reform the outstanding feature of the movement is its skepticism concerning imprisonment altogether, and its search for new and more adequate methods of treatment outside prison walls."[9]

---

[6] Cressey, op. cit., p. 45.

[7] Ralph S. Banay, "Should Prisons Be Abolished?" New York Times Magazine (June 30, 1955), p. 19.

---

[8] Max Grunhut, "Penal Reform" (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 11.

[9] Ibid.

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF RESOCIALIZATION

The most conspicuous problem in corrections today are lack of knowledge and unsystematic approach to the development of programs and techniques. Changes in correctional development have been guided primarily by what John Wright calls "intuitive opportunism," a kind of goal-oriented quessing.[10] By and large, the programs which have been initiated in correctional practice have either been the product of well-educated hunches, stimulated by humanitarianism, or borrowed from other fields.[11]

Era of reform. In 1840, Captain Alexander Maconochie was placed in charge of the English penal colony on Norfolk Island. Before this, he had had experience in penal establishments and had written on convict management. Maconochie introduced a "mark system" as his chief instrument for establishing good order and efficient administration on the island.

The fundamental principal of the "mark system" was the substitution of a specific task for the customary time sentence. Instead of requiring the convicts to serve a fixed term regardless of what they did or failed to do while in his charge, Maconochie gave them an opportunity to reduce their sentences. Upon arrival at the penal colony, each prisoner was debited with a number of "marks" proportional to the seriousness of his offense. These he had to redeem by deportment, labor, and study; and when he had cancelled all his "marks," he was eligible for conditional release or "ticket-of-leave." By means of "marks" he also secured food, supplies, and special privileges, and by the forfeiture of them, he was punished for his misconduct. The purpose of the system was to give the prisoner an incentive to work and to improve himself through the development of initiative and responsibility. As Maconochie so aptly explained, "when a man keeps the key of his own prison, he is soon persuaded to fit it to the lock."[12]

---

[10] John C. Wright, "Curiosity and Opportunism," Trans-Action, (January-February, 1965), p. 38.

[11] Mark S. Richmond, "On Conquering Prison Walls," Federal Probation (June, 1966), p. 22.

His innovations were praised by the reformers in Great Britain, and in 1849 he was made governor of the Birmingham Jail in England. There he installed and expanded his "mark system," but after two years he was charged with being too lenient and forced to resign.

In 1854, Sir Walter Crofton became director of the Irish convict prisons, and during the next eight years, while he occupied that office, he established an administration that attracted the attention of penal authorities throughout the world. In the development of his program he utilized the "mark system" of Maconochie, and established the "intermediate prison." During this stage, which was never less than six months, prisoners lived in comparative freedom under the supervision of a few unarmed guards. They worked together and were housed in unlocked portable huts. The ruling principle was individualization of treatment, and the number of prisoners in a colony was not allowed to exceed one hundred. The purpose of the "intermediate prison" was to determine whether the prisoner had reformed and to train him for full freedom by the enjoyment of partial freedom as a preliminary step. Every prisoner had to pass the test of the "intermediate prison" before he could secure his ticket-of-leave.[13]

---

[12] John V. Barry,"Alexander Maconochie," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, (July-August, 1956), p. 146.

Knowledge of the Irish system attracted the attention of penologists in America, and interest in reform was aroused. As a result, a National Prison Association was organized at Cincinnati in October, 1870; at that time, it adopted a declaration of principles which stressed the indeterminate sentence and the classification and reformation of prisoners.

The Elmira Reformatory in New York was opened in 1876; it became the model for all the others that followed. The reformatory was different from the typical prisons of this era in two outstanding ways: (1) sentences to the reformatory were indeterminate, and prisoners could be released on parole; and (2) all inmates in the reformatory were graded into three classes according to achievement and conduct, only those who were in the "first class" were eligible for parole.[14]

---

[13] Cressey, op. cit., p. 45.

[14] Barnes and Teeters, op. cit., p. 425.

Elmira was a young, first offender institution and it was there that parole really began for supervised release.

Within 25 years of the establishment of Elmira, reformatories were constructed in twelve states. Enthusiasm for the reformatory program ran high, and predictions were made that it would sweep the country; but the movement had already passed its peak and was on the decline by 1910. A few more reformatories were opened, but on the whole the program did not outlive its own founders.

In 1897, Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise, director of the English prisons, arrived in the United States to study the reformatory system. Upon his return to England, he opened a specialized institution at the small town of Borstall for male offenders between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one. Thus was begun the now famous Borstal System. The System is based entirely on individualized treatment, both in the institution and during the period of aftercare.[15]

It is not difficult to find the important factors that caused the failure of the reformatory system in America. Foremost among these was the persistent preoccupation with mere custody and security, which stifled all ingenuity and enterprise and dominated the construction and operation of the great majority of the reformatories.

In summary, it may be said that the reform period made several last contributions to American penology. These were (1) the introduction of the indeterminate sentence and parole; and (2) the establishment of a positive reform program through education.

---

[15] R. L. Bradley, "The English Borstal System after the War," Federal Probation (December, 1948), p. 19.

III. ALTERNATIVES TO CONFINEMENT

During the more than 150 years that comprise the history of American prisons before 1935, various attempts were made to establish prisons as agencies of moral institutions, as educational institutions, and finally as great industrial centers, but in each instance the attempt failed. The fall of the industrial prisons in America, due to passage of repressive laws forced by free enterprise, plunged many penal administrators into confusion and sent all in search of a new integrating principle of operation. This quest continues today.

Perhaps the most important development during this period was the invitation of community treatment programs of probation and parole. These services provided an alternative to confinement and opportunity to confront an individual's problem in the environment where eventually almost all offenders must succeed or fail.

The first probation law in America was enacted in Massachusetts in 1878. John Augustus, a prosperous shoemaker of Boston, was the first salaried probation officer.[16] Probation may be defined as the suspension of final judgement by the court, giving the offender an opportunity to improve his conduct while living as a member in the community, subject to conditions which may be imposed by the court and under the supervision and friendly guidance of a probation officer.[17] In other words, probation is neither leniency nor clemency, but the conditional suspension of imprisonment of carefully selected convicted offenders who are helped to become responsible, law-abiding persons while living in the community under the guidance and direction of a probation officer.

---

[16] John Augustus--First Probation Officer, National Probation Association, New York (1939), p. 4.

Protection of the public and treatment of the individual offender are the primary goals of probation. By helping the offender become a law-abiding, self-respecting person, society is protected. No person should be placed on probation if there is reason to believe he will be a threat to the community. Pre-sentence investigation is sometimes used prior to selection for probation. When a person is placed on probation, the court believes that the offender, his family, and the community at large will benefit more by his remaining in society than by incarceration. A well-established principle in American corrections is that no persons should be sent to a correctional institution until it is definitely determined he is not a fit subject for probation.

Throughout the period of probation supervision, the probationer is subject to commitment to an institution if he violates the conditions of probation imposed by the court. And probation is not granted as a right. Instead, it is a privilege and an opportunity. A basic premise in probation is that some persons need help and understanding rather than confinement.

---

[17] Probation, The Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedure (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939), p. 16.

Parole is the release of a convicted offender to the community under supervision of a parole officer and under certain restrictions and requirements, after he has served a portion of his sentence in a correctional institution. Parole is concerned primarily with helping the committed offender make the difficult transition from the prison community and an acceptable adjustment in society.

Like probation, there are conditions with which the parolee must comply. Parole can be revoked if the parolee fails to meet the conditions of his release by commission of a new offense or by infraction of one of the regulations of parole. In this light, parole then is a continuation of the sentence which is served in the community instead of in an institution. Parole is a trial period at resocialization under supervision. The important thing is that the offender is out of the correctional institution.

IV. CIRCUMSTANCES AND PROBLEMS OF RELEASE

The transition from the highly structured and regimented environment of the institution to life in the free community presents many problems for the offender. Society accepts the expense of clothing, guarding, and to a lesser degree, treating the prisoner, but it does not encourage providing him with funds to start a new life upon release. Upon leaving the prison, the inmate may have some savings. He may obtain "gate money," the cash gratuity given released prisoners by the institution to ease the financial problems of restoration to the community. But usually he has slender and temporary resources.

The immediate problem of most former prisoners is survival in a society which emphasizes money, not only as a means of meeting physical needs but also as a measure of personal worthiness. To secure food, shelter, clothing, and transportation, money is an immediate necessity. Assistance from relatives and from welfare agencies is not the best solution for the former prisoner's economic plight. The need to accept such charity deals a blow to his pride. Relatives may not have the resources to provide relief or may be able to give too little to meet the needs. The release of the offender will have terminated the public assistance his family had been receiving during his incarceration. Reliance on family funds usually will not solve the individual's economic problem, and if there is nowhere else for him to turn, he may be thrust back into the very situation he is supposed to avoid.

Since resources available to the prisoner on release are so slender, employment becomes doubly important as a solution to self-maintenance. Yet, there are major difficulties in ex-inmates' finding employment. When he seeks work, the ex-inmate is apt to have more emotional problems than the usual applicant. A defeatist attitude is likely to sap his initiative and drive. Most released prisoners fear that their records will become known by their employers or fellow workers. Prisoners debate whether telling the truth will abort their chances for work and whether forged references will win a job only to be lost when the truth is discovered.

The former prisoner frequently lacks qualities which would cause employers to be eager to hire him. The bulk of the releasees have had an inferior work record before confinement. Their skills usually are at a low level. The applicant may fail to present his case effectively.

Prisons may not prepare the man vocationally and attitudinally. Ideally, the releasee would have acquired during confinement those vocational skills in demand in the local job market. The work routine and productive procedures in prison industries would have given him experience in the tempo, discipline, and other circumstances of free employment. This ideal is difficult to achieve when prison industries are required to operate in a manner which maximizes opportunities to reduce prison costs and minimize competition with free enterprise.

Imprisonment leaves some stigma on the released inmate. Incarceration may weaken self-reliance and promote dependence on others. The prison routine creates habits inconsistent with family life and patterns on community life. Relationships with family, friends, and work associates are interrupted. Picking up the threads of his previous life, the releasee may have difficulty in reducing the hostilities aroused in him by prison frustration and by the loss of years of his life. The first flush of freedom may deprive him temporarily of what self-control he does possess and release stored-up desires in a burst of license. At least initially, his reactions against the regimentation of prison life may interfere with his adjustment to the routines of daily work, supervision by others, and consistent work-effort.

Prolonged incarceration may have isolated the inmate from the community to such a degree that he may find the world into which he emerges strange. His family and friends have changed in his absence. Techniques of work have changed. He has to learn again how to use transporation facilities and how to order a meal in a restaurant.

In regard to the parolee, already burdened with his anxieties, he finds himself in a delicate situation. Conditions placed upon his behavior demonstrate to the parolee that he is not completely free. He must be wary of his associates, of drinking, choice of places of amusement, changes in job or residence, and long journeys. Acutely self-conscious and aware of the possibility that his status in the community may be challenged, the former prisoner is likely to weigh the probable consequences of any behavior, no matter how innocuous. His own sense of insecurity and uncertainty may cause him to question the behavior of family, friends, and business acquaintances. He may see slights and persecution where they do not exist. When he encounters rebuffs in his search for work and when he is frequently questioned by the police, his suspicions are given substance.

If he is married, he leaves prison to be confronted by family problems. If his family has been receiving public assistance during his confinement, his release terminates this source of income. Old debtors, or those acquired by his family during his imprisonment, press for payment. His return may require a search for larger and more expensive living quarters. The martial relationship may have been weakened in his absence. Even though he may have left the institution with the intention of living a law-abiding life, faced with numerous problems, he may rapidly assume a defeatist attitude and return to former criminal associates, or new ones, by whom he is accepted.

One of the most serious problems confronting society and corrections is that of recidivism, the proneness of many offenders to continue a life of crime. It is well known that some situational or "first" offenders become "occasional" or even "chronic" offenders. In many cases it is because of their inability to regain their self-respect owing to inadequacies of prison life, to guilt feelings, or to inability to make adequate adjustments after release from prison.

The problem of recidivism is a serious one, but drastic legislation is not the answer. It is usually brought forth in an atmosphere of hostility or hysteria rather than one of helpfulness to society. Many inmates are released before any reformation takes place, while others, who could conceivably be released shortly after entering prison, remain for many years. Long prison sentences stifle all hope of reform. The prison poison permeates the inmate, and when he is finally released he is almost helpless to make an adequate adjustment to free society.

V. ERA OF EXPERIMENTATION

Corrections today displays evidence of a number of evolutions in thought and practice, each seeking to cope with the different problems of punishing, deterring, and rehabilitating offenders. It is highly probable that a generation from now the 1960's will be recalled as the years during which greater progress was made in overcoming sterotyped prison traditions than at any time in history. These are years of rapid acceleration in correctional practice. It seems inevitable that the changes now taking place will be associated with (if not attributed to) crystallizing public concern over the problems of crime, criminals, and corrections, and growing insistence on results achieved. The concepts are not new; their emphasis is.

Work release. Work release is a program under which inmates of correctional institutions may be employed in nearby communities, returning to the institution at night. It is the most significant provision of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965, signed into law by President Johnson on September 10, 1965. The work-release concept, although more than 50 years old, has been accepted in many states only recently. The so-called "Huber Law," was the earliest legislation in this field. [18]

Work release is not a substitute for probation or parole. It is not part of an internal system of punishment and reward. Nor is it an obligatory means of offsetting the cost of public welfare payments to dependent families. It is intended to be a selective resource for the correctional treatment of certain offenders.

---

[18] Richmond, op. cit., p. 17.

Work release will be an effective correctional tool only to the extent that it is used wisely for specific purposes and as a means toward attainment of goals of treatment, training, and control of selected offenders. Work release is a bridge between the institution and the community. Its particular usefulness, in some degree, depends upon where in the spectrum of correctional treatment and control it is applied. It has many possible applications, for example, to both the intake and discharge ends of institutionalization.

At the point of intake, especially for short-term offenders who are not suitable for probation or some other disposition, work release may provide opportunity for (1) continued employment, education or training; (2) continued or resume family responsibilities, as through contributions to family support; (3) accumulating savings for release, to make restitution or pay legitimate debts; (4) continuing or acquiring the self-respect that flows from self-support; (5) a practical way of demonstrating ability and trustworthiness to gain or regain employer and community acceptance; and (6) remaining or becoming a contributing member of society.[19]

---

[19] Community Work--An Alternative to Imprisonment, Correctional Research Association (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 4.

Oriented toward the discharge end of institutionalization, especially for longer-term prisoners and those in whom substantial investments have been made to overcome handicapping deficiencies, work release offers similar opportunities and at lease the following in addition: (1) a pre-release transitional experience leading to increasing personal responsibility; (2) a valuable experience in actual work situations related to prior vocational or occupational training; (3) furthering the education and training started at the institution; (4) giving the paroling authority a means of testing suitability for parole before final decision is reached; and (5) reducing the risks and fears of both the offender and the community associated with the difficult period of adjustment immediately following imprisonment.[20]

There are differences in the manner in which various institutions and correctional systems have viewed work release and considered its values. These differences have affected the quality and direction of implementation.

As effective as the program may be when used for the "right" offenders, at the "right" times, for the "right" purposes, it is not without its problems and limitations. Some of these have a philosophical basis, depending upon how the program is used. Not only is work release not a substitute for inadequate or nonexistent probation or parole, a means of ameliorating the rigors of a sentence to imprisonment nor a reward for trustworthiness, it is not a panacea for correctional treatment of convicted offenders. There is danger, however, that more results will be claimed for work release than the program can produce.

---

[20] Ibid.

Furloughs. One of the provisions of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 gives the Attorney General authority to extend the limits of the place of confinement of a prisoner as to whom there is reasonable cause to believe he will honor his trust, by authorizing him, under prescribed conditions, to visit a specifically designated place or places for a period not to exceed thirty days and return to the same or another institution or facility. An extension of limits may be granted only to permit a visit to a dying relative, attendance at the funeral of a relative, the obtaining of medical services not otherwise available, the contacting of prospective employers, or for any other compelling reason consistent with the public interest.[21]

The term "furlough" can easily become confused with leave or reprieve which perhaps most adult institutions have been willing to grant under extenuating circumstances, such as family crisis. A prisoner on special leave customarily travels under escort, while on "furlough" he is on his own. From a correctional standpoint, one of the most "compelling" reasons for granting furloughs is to reenforce family ties, where such exist, with parents, spouses, and children. Correctional workers have long been accustomed to witnessing the steady, and seemingly inevitable erosion of family ties over the years when their efforts otherwise have been directed to preparing offenders for normal community life, including the resumption of normal family ties and responsibilities. Likewise, correctional workers have been concerned that "correction" has been one-sided. While substantial investments in offenders were being made in institutions, little or no work was being done with offenders' families.[22] The timely and judicious use of home furloughs can do much to alleviate the imbalance.

---

[21] Edward V. Long, "The Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965," Federal Probation (December, 1965), p. 5.

Half-way houses. Half-way houses are facilities established within the community to ease the transition into free society usually operated by a civic group or agency apart from the correctional institution. Half-way houses have been in the experimental stages for almost fifty years, but it is in recent years that they have received more widespread support. There are half-way houses with many different objectives; however they can be conveniently categorized into two types: (1) the general purpose house which provides assistance in the community to all types of ex-inmates during the initial period after their release; and (2) the specific objective house which is set up to provide services to groups with special adjustment problems.

As samples of the two types of half-way houses it will be sufficient to review one of each type, the first being the Shaw Residence in Washington, D. C. which is operated by the Prisoner's Aid Association under a grant of federal funds from the National Institution of Mental Health. The Shaw Residence was established as a bridge "at the point of failure" with the hope of providing assistance to many who are released by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The Shaw Residence

---

[22] Richmond, op. cit., p. 18.

> . . . do(es) not limit those whom we accept by offense, prior record, or age. . . . facility is available to those who are in need and considered best able to utilize the service. The applicant should have demonstrated some inclination toward self-improvement during his confinement. He must be lacking a suitable residence and frequently may not have located satisfactory employment. He must not be handicapped with a physical or mental disease.[23]

When a releasee is accepted at Shaw Residence, he is assigned a room which is usually a multiple sleeping unit housing one, two, three or four men. He pays fifteen dollars weekly for room and board if he has a job and at least fifty dollars in his possession. With less than fifty dollars, he will pay seven dollars and fifty cents a week until his first paycheck.

An effort is made to make Shaw Residence a real home during a man's stay there, and it is operated much like any family home.

> . . . each man is required to make his own bed and keep his immediate area clean. . . . he also has a maintenance assignment. There are few rules which limit one's freedom. . . . there is a nightly curfew and attendance at group meetings is mandatory. . . . immediately upon arrival individual planning is begun for his return to independent living in the community. . . . he is encouraged to spend weekends away from the residence. . . . he is assisted in developing new associations and re-establishing home ties by bringing friends to Shaw Residence for meals, snacks, and recreation.[24]

Also, during a man's stay at Shaw, he is provided counseling about financial matters and is encouraged to have a bank account as well as to avoid indiscriminate purchases. Because of the twenty-four hour nature of the operation, much of the staff is part-time but is well qualified professionally to carry out its task. Shaw Residence was chosen here, not for its originality, but because it is typical of the general purpose type of half-way house.

---

[23] Harry Manley, "Shaw Residence," Speeches Delivered at the Twenty-Third Meeting (Richmond: Southern States Prison Association, June 6, 1965). p. 24.

[24] Ibid,. p. 25

Daytop Lodge in Brooklyn, New York, deals with specific problems. Because of its break with traditional modes of treatment, it is one of the most interesting projects encountered in this review.

> . . . Daytop Lodge was born against the depressing backdrop of failure and frustration known to every probation and parole officer who has attempted to work with addicts. No matter how warm the relationship or close the surveillance, it appears to be almost inevitable that sooner or later the user would lapse and build up a new habit, a condition we would discover only after the expense had become prohibitive and our client was involved in a new series of crimes to support his habit. . . .[25]

Daytop is unique because it utilizes the resident himself as a therapeutic device very similar to the methods of Synanon. The theory is that an addict is unable to fool another addict and that "reality therapy" is needed if the addict is ever to face his problem

> . . . Instead of the polite, inconsequential Gaston and Alphonse type of therapy procedures of most clinics and prisons where jail rule of "don't pull the covers off me and I won't pull them off you" prevails, the group therapy process at Daytop Lodge is modeled after the practice of Synanon. . . . procedure must be a gut experience, free of phony attempts at self-defense, self-deception, self-pity. . . . speaker is forced to accept responsibility for his immediate behavior, not to pass it off on society, proverty, an unloving mother, or a punitive father. . . .[26]

There are three basic rules which must be adhered to by residents and these are explained by residents themselves at the initial reception of a new man: (1) Total, complete, undeviating abstinence from all drugs of any kind whatsoever; (2) no physical violence; and (3) cooperation with the Lodge program.[27] What the results of this program will be no one can say at this point; however, there seems to be a great deal to be said for this approach and in the words of one resident, "Daytop Lodge won't fail because I won't let it fail. It means my life. I can't afford to let it go under."[28]

---

[25] Joseph Shelly, "Daytop Lodge: Halfway Houses for Drug Addicts," Federal Probation (December, 1957), p. 46.

[26] Ibid., p. 50.

Experience has shown that half-way houses do help some individuals adjust to society and normal living. Experience has also shown that not all individuals benefit by participation in a particular half-way house program, although most benefit to some extent, even if returned to a correctional institution. The variety of existing half-way houses offers an additional weapon in the arsenal of rehabilitation.

The open institution. The open institution plays an increasingly important part in the prison systems of the world. In its origins the emphasis was on younger offenders and prisoners who were approaching the end of their sentences.[29]

Walled prisons have been criticized for cutting inmates off from normal contacts with the community and for imposing a daily regime promoting rebellion and parasitism. The open institution has been advocated as an answer to such criticism.

The open institution is characterized by the absence of walls and the substitution of psychological controls for physical barriers against escape. Authorities strive to make conditions within the institution resemble life in the free community as much as possible. The prison denies the inmate day-by-day little things of life. The more normal innovations for prison life, the better for society.

---

[27] _Ibid_., p. 53.

[28] _Ibid_., p. 54.

[29] Norval Morris, "Prisons in Evolution," _Federal Probation_ (December, 1965), p. 25

Inmates are permitted free movement within the grounds. Work tasks and conditions are made similar to those of employment outside. Family visits and correspondence are encouraged.

Penologists generally agree that the open institution will not replace the closed prison. To obtain properly selected inmates, the open institution requires the closed prison as the source of its population and to afford a place for testing inmates for their possession of attitudes consistent with self-discipline. Furthermore, the possibility of reassignment to a closed prison serves as a deterrent against infractions in the open institution.

The more permissive atmosphere is intended to be more appropriate for therapy. The open institution is more economical to construct and operate than the closed prison. One of the major goals is to create an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of the individual and to provide maximum opportunity for positive behavior changes.

Intensive community treatment. Perhaps the best known of the country's efforts at controlled experimentation in the correctional fields is the California Youth Authority's Community Treatment Project, now in its sixth year. Operating within a rigorous evaluation design, it offers an excellent illustration of the profitable partnership which can develop when carefully devised program innovations are combined with sound research. The program is unique inasmuch as the caseloads are very small and in its method of classification. The offenders are matched with a supervisor experienced in specific behavioral disorders.

The goal is to develop a treatment plan which is tailored to the needs of each type of offender. An unusual and controversial feature of the experiment is the frequent use of short-time detention at the Agency's Reception Center to assume compliance with program requirements and to "set limits" on the behavior of the participants.[30] The detention may vary from a few hours to a few days.

In 1944, California reorganized her prison system and established an adult authority. The primary responsibility of this agency was the administration of parole, but it was also given other broad powers so that it might help to coordinate the various steps in the process of rehabilitation from the time of commitment, through institutional correction and community supervision, to final discharge from custody.[31]

Reception center parole. Diagnostic parole is a program whereby all commitments from the juvenile court are referred to a reception center where they can be screened for eligibility for parole, either immediately or after a short period of treatment. These programs were conceived in California in part as a response to acute population pressures in over-crowded institutions.

The success of reception center parole has been encouraging. To date, parole from reception centers has been confined to the juvenile field. However, there is no inherent reason why this approach should not be taken with adults, and hopefully it will be so used in the near future.

---

[30] California Adult Authority, Principles, Policies, and Programs (Sacramento: Department of Corrections, 1952), p. 5.

[31] Ibid., p. 4.

Increased Correctional Effectiveness. The Increased Correctional Effectiveness program (I. C. E.) is an attempt to hold down prison population and costs and to reduce the period of the institutionalization by increasing the impact of treatment. The program was introduced in California.[32]

Inmates with high parole-success potential are selected through "base-expectancy" (B. E.) scores. Information on histories of thousands of inmates and parolees are used to determine factors predicting parole success. These factors include type of crime, alcholic habits, work history and family criminal record. In addition to the B. E. scores, the choices are supported by psychological tests and interviews at the Reception-Guidance Centers and study by paroling authorities. The I. C. E. program is designed for middle scorers, who are assigned to special housing-treatment centers, in the pattern of the therapeutic community, located in eight correctional institutions. The residents are required to put in a full day's work. Four evenings a week they meet in large groups to discuss adjustment problems and sometimes to hear various speakers discuss appropriate topics. Twice weekly they meet in small groups under the leadership of correctional counselors, custodial staff, and work supervisors. Two to three months before release of an inmate, his immediate family is invited to attend the sessions.

---

[32] Joseph W. Eaton, Stone Walls Not a Prison Make (Springfield: C. C. Thomas, 1962), p. 173.

Depending on their adjustment, the I. C. E. inmates may be recommended for earlier parole after their legal minimum terms have been reached. Parolees are assigned to parole agents according to the expected degree of supervision required. When a parolee given evidence of maladjustment, he can be returned briefly to the prison without losing his parole status while he regains self-control.[33]

Pilot Intensive Counseling Organization. Increased Correctional Effectiveness (I. C. E.) exploits the preliminary findings of another California experiment, Pilot Intensive Counseling Organization (P. I. C. O.). In a preliminary report, Stuart Adams explains that the experiment was designed first, to promote identification of amenable ("corrigible") and non-amenable ("incorrigible") classes of offenders, and, second, to measure the effects of individual counseling sessions, averaging some nine months in duration, and of some group counseling.

The principal criterion of performance was "return to custody" of "lock-up" in state facilities. Other criteria were parole agent ratings, parole suspensions and removal from parole while under suspension. Adam's findings include: (1) treated amenable were decidedly superior to control amenables in avoiding return to state custody. These differences became greater as the number of post-release months increased; (2) treated non-amenables showed relatively poor performances as compared with control non-amenables; and (3) non-amenables appear to perform better in the earlier period of parole than in the long run.[34]

---

[33] California Adult Authority, op. cit., p. 7.

Perhaps their spirit has been the remarkable feature of events in California corrections since 1944. The degree of support given research and experimentation with new concepts in California is unusual in correctiona administration. Joseph Eaton attached the label "newism" as an ideology with the presumption that new developments or practices are superior to those old or not quite so new. It is the opposite of a philosophy which clings to the tradition and ways of the past.[35]

VI. CONCEPT AND PHILOSOPHY OF PRE-RELEASE

After World War II, it became evident to enlightened correctional administrators that parole and probation, although very useful tools in rehabilitation, were not the total answer. An era of exploration began that is continuing today. Pre-release, resocialization, reorientation, and reintegration are words that crept into the vocabulary of correctional personnel.

The need for some pre-release preparation is perhaps self-evident to most correctional and parole personnel.

> . . . the prisoner needs help in briding the gap between prison and the free world. To turn him loose without proper preparation for what faces him, or to fail to given him guidance after he leaves is manifestly unfair. . . .36

---

[34] Stuart Adams, Interaction between Individual Interview Therapy and Treatment Amenability in Older Youth Authority Wards, Monograph 2 (Sacramento: Department of Corrections, July, 1961), p. 34.

[35] Eaton, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[36] American Correctional Association, Manual of Correctional Standards (New York: The American Correctional Association, 1962), p. 548.

The concept, therefore, is not new. What is new is the organized effort to establish centers or places within the institution which accomplish these broad objectives which have long been accepted.

Pre-release is that portion of incarceration prior to release either by discharge or parole in which an intensive and concentrated effort is made by the institution to help the prisoner in bridging the gap between prison and free society. It should be pointed out here, at least in this writer's opinion, the distinction between pre-release and pre-parole. Although these terms are often used synonymously, which is possibly acceptable in institutions having indeterminated sentences, there appear to be grounds for distinction, especially in states paroling only 50 per cent or so of their population. Pre-parole may have the same objectives, but is concerned only with parolees. Pre release, on the other hand, encompasses both the parolee and the dischargee while recognizing that each may, and indeed, do have specific problems, and needs. _The Manual of Correctional Standards_ accepts the following definition which differs in form but not in substance with the foregoing:

> . . . operation within the institution of a program which aims at utilizing the period of confinement for preparing the inmate physically, vocationally, mentally, and spiritually for his return to society, puts forth intensive effort, at the close of the term, toward effecting his release under optimum conditions as far as he, his dependents, and the community are concerned. . . .[37]

---

[37] _Ibid_., p. 534.

The pre-release program is an experiment designed to assist the offender with his re-integration. Program designs are weighted heavily with emphasis upon meeting the needs of the individual, preparing the offender to meet unflinchingly the problems he will face after his release, utilizing available resources to the greatest extent, turning community influences into recognizable assets. Finally, the program is designed to keep the offender in tune with the free community during his period of institutionalization.

Ideally, the preparation of the offender for his return to the free community should begin the first day he enters the correctional process. The transition from institutional to community life, if it is to be a smooth re-assimilation of the offender into free society must be preceded by treatment programs which are unique and dedicated to serve definite functions.

Employment. One aim of the program is to provide guidance and placement. The program assists each prisoner in job planning which is consistent with his abilities, interest, and prior training.

Counseling. Counseling services are a fundamental part of the program. This area is considered to be of vital importance because it sets the mood and attitude of the entire program. The primary focus of the counseling program is on the day-to-day problems the prisoner encounters on the job, at home, and with his peer group. In addition to the counseling sessions, group discussions, involving individuals and agencies within the community and their sources have been organized and are utilized.

Education. Local community resources are utilized in the program. Educational activities, consistent with the needs and interests of the prisoners, are used to supplement training which the prisoner has received in the institution. The purpose is to provide new academic or vocational skills.

Home visits. Visits in the homes of parents, wives, and other interested relatives are an integral part of the program. As a means of re-introducing the offender to his family and neighborhood, a flexible pass system is in effect. Under this system, "residents" spend more and more time away from the "center" as they progress through the program and demonstrate their readiness for increased responsibility.

Religious programs. Residents are encouraged to attend, establish membership in and participate in the activities of the church of their religious faith. Local clergymen are invited to provide religious counseling for residents of their faiths.

Health care. Residents will have complete medical and dental examinations prior to pre-release assignment and throughout their residence.

Infraction of rules. Disciplinary infractions are handled on an individual basis. Serious misconduct may result in transfer out of the program and back to the correctional institution.

Aside from pre-release preparations, there is real need for the prospective releasee to spend a preliminary period of semi-normality under institutional restraint, to serve as a transitional period prior to actual departure from the prison. American corrections is just reaching the threshold concerning this vitally important problem. Various countries have been engaged in this type of pre-release transition for years. In Colombia, for instance, a "preparatory release" period precedes his "conditional release" period. This may be granted two or three years beforehand. The candidate is given the opportunity of securing work outside the prison, returning to the prison at night. In Argentina, an area of the prison in Buenos Aires is set aside for preparolees. It is attractively furnished, homelike in every respect. At meals, the men sit at tables for four, and have a lounging and reading room furnished with comfortable chairs with current magazines available. They have individual rooms, not unlike modern hotel rooms. The candidates may go out into the community to look for work and are also aided by trained vocational workers who assist in adjusting each man's situation.[38]

Much experimentation followed in attempts to formulate workable procedures to help prepare prisoners for their return to the community. From these efforts evolved three principles now recognized as essential in establishing a realistic program of pre-release preparation:

> 1. To make available to pre-release inmates information and assistance deemed pertinent in release planning.
>
> 2. To provide each pre-release inmate the opportunity, in a non-threatening situation, to discuss problems and anxieties relating to his release and future social adjustment.
>
> 3. To provide a system of evaluating the effectiveness of release planning procedures.[39]

Pre-release guidance centers. Early in 1961, the Attorney General recommended to the Congress that funds be appropriated to the Bureau of Prisons for the specific purpose of establishing a series of experimental projects to test improved methods for the treatment of juvenile and youthful offenders committed to his custody by the Federal Courts. After careful study, the decision was made to establish pre-release guidance centers in metropolitan areas where the number of releasees would justify such facilities. These centers are designed to facilitate the orderly re-introduction of youth and juvenile offenders into the community through the use of available community resources together with a carefully planned guidance and counseling program.

---

[38] Gus Harrison, "New Concepts in Release Procedures," Proceedings, American Correctional Association, 1953, p. 246.

[39] J. E. Baker, "Preparing Prisoners for Their Return to the Community," Federal Probation (June, 1966), p. 43.

Three basic types or models of guidance center designs have been utilized in the project. The first is an independent residential unit staffed and operated by the Bureau of Prisons; the second is a residential unit under the supervision of a private agency or institution with which the Bureau of Prisons contracts for services. The third design involves the establishment of a center jointly operated by the Bureau of Prisons and a state or local correctional agency.

All centers are located in suitable, leased quarters, centrally located and close to public transportation and recreational facilities. The neighborhoods in which the centers are located are racially integrated. Living accommodations are furnished in private, semi-private or dormitory rooms. Some facilities also provide complete kitchens and dining space, and all centers provide a group counseling room, office space, and an area for leisure time activities. Pre-release guidance centers, at the time of this study, were located in Chicago, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, New York City, and Washington, D. C.

Goals of the center are to insure that upon release the young offender has a savings account, feels more comfortable handling his finances, has a civilian wardrobe, and steady employment. The releasee should be familiar with the community and feel accepted by the community. He is encouraged to be involved when necessary with therapeutic resources such as Alcholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, be an active participant in socially acceptable leisure and recreational activities, and perhaps feel motivated to engage in higher educational studies. The offender is now prepared to make the difficult transition back into society.

While no program can be set up that will solve every man's problems completely, or answer all of his questions, research has shown that the better informed person is more likely to make a success. The released prisoner, upon his departure, should be reminded that every man is endowed with free choice. He should not kid himself that people and circumstances will make this choice for him.

Pre-release programs. Approximately 25 states and the federal government now are making some effort at establishing pre-release centers. Obviously, in a work of this length all cannot be considered, nor need they be, as most are very similar at least in purpose and program. Therefore, two have been selected for examination because they generally include most of the concepts which are also noted in other states. The first of these to be considered is the Pre-Parole Release Center of the Colorado Division of Corrections.

The Colorado program is based on the premise that any program, to justify its existence, must fulfill a need, the state's need as well as the inmates's. Colorado operates under a maximum and minimum law wherein the sentencing judge sets both the maximum time a man may be incarcerated as well as the minimum time. Parole is automatically the difference between the minimum and maximum, and since 94 per cent of its population are paroled, its pre-release program is essentially pre-parole. The center gives priority to the parolee; however, the dischargee is accepted if room permits. The only case which is not permitted is the detainer case because of the obvious security risk.

The program is designed to run for five weeks and is organized on what is called the A-B-C-D series, that is, each program is a complete unit and not dependent upon another for continuity. The program continuously revolves and a man may enter at any point, D, B, C, or A, and still complete the program. A new group of men is started each Monday.

A part of the program is built on the premise that an inmate about to be released has many concrete and practical problems which if unresolved can turn into major stumbling blocks in the immediate period following release. Time and effort are spent attempting to alleviate some of these, i. e., clearing up driver's licenses, obtaining Social Security cards, and issuing of identification cards. The I. D. cards are deemed vital. Just what does a released inmate use for identification? His discharge papers? His parole certificate? Surely an identification card of a civilian type will at least assist the individual in avoiding some embarrassing situations, not even to mention the psychological confidence it may give him. True, this problem is minor, but most of the releasee's problems are minor; however, when added together they become more than many can overcome during their first days in free society.

Many men who come through the center have legal difficulties which need to be resolved and assistance is provided through local bar associations. Local professional people and businessmen give their time to discuss such problems as "how to obtain a job," "how to keep a job," "wardrobe tips," "how to buy a car," and other topics of vital and immediate concern to the inmate. In addition to providing vital information, this part of the program assists in easing the fears of the inmate, not to mention the general public. The program brings the civilian face to face with the inmates and this tends to destroy or reduce stereotype.

The general program consists of one-half day work and attendance in various classes for one-half day. Being a separate facility with its own maintenance and operation problems, the center has constructive work available and necessary; however, there is a definite difference from previous work in the prison. While at the pre-release center, the inmate has much more personal responsibility for his job and meeting his schedule. It is important for the inmate to assume the responsibility of arriving at a predetermined place on time without being reminded to do so.

Normal recreational facilities are provided and athletic teams from the center participate in the local area leagues in the adjacent communities. Visits from home are encouraged and are premitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. The visits are informal and take place in a large area similar to the lobby of a hotel. A picnic area is provided and families may bring picnic lunches with them. During a man's stay at the center, his mail is not censored and he may write one letter each day. For the first time during his incarceration he is permitted to have some money in his pocket. Nickels and dimes are permitted--all other money is contraband. During the last week of his stay he is permitted to go to town and make purchases of clothing and other personal needs.

Two staff members are employed for the purpose of counseling, psychotherapy; and psychodrama is used also. The religious program is essentially the same as the rest of the institution with a chaplain being available and participation being voluntary.

Probably the most significant difference to be noted between the Colorado Pre-Parole Release Center and the main institution is in the area of security and control. The Center is minimum security in every sense. When a man arrives at the Center, he is assigned a room and is given a key to it. Also, his prison clothing is discarded. There are no bars on the windows, and the unit resembles a modern motel. From midnight to work call there are no custodial personnel on the unit and only inmates are there. There is an outside patrol which checks the Center two or three times during the period primarily as a fire check, to assist if there is illness, and to count the men in case someone has escaped. There is a well marked perimeter around the Center, outside of which is considered off limits. The inmates are oriented to the fact that if one goes beyond that perimeter, he is considered an escapee. The Center began operation in February, 1959, and in May of that year three men left the Center, walked into town, and returned on the bet that they would not be caught. They lost their bet, were charged with escape and received two additional years on their sentences. It is the last time the boundary rule has been tested.

Another pre-release center which is of more recent origin and in some ways more extensive than the Colorado center is provided by the Texas Department of Corrections. It is the Jester Pre-Release Center located near Sugarland, Texas. It is especially significant because it is an example of what can be accomplished with available facilities and appropriations. The program was begun in September, 1963, primarily for dischargees but was later revised on the request of the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles to include parolees. The Texas center is highly indebted to the Colorado program but differs from it in several ways:

1. Only fifty per cent of Texas' inmates are paroled: therefore, the center's population is about equally divided between dischargees and parolees.

2. An older maximum security unit is being utilized; therefore, some evidence of security is still obvious, but it also must be considered a minimum security or honor type unit. Unarmed custodial officers supervise the work and center security, functioning more as advisors than guards.

3. Utilization of community resources and recreational facilities is much in evidence. Inmates are taken to public functions and religious services in civilian clothes.

4. Employment placement services are available at the center. Inmates have been hired, while still at the center, by local businessmen.

One cannot help but be impressed with the Texas Pre-Release Center because it was born out of a definite need and with very modest beginnings and has expanded to a full-scale pre-release center. Approximately ninety per cent of all inmates leaving the Texas Department of Corrections have completed the pre-release program. Although it is quite early to make judgement in regard to success rates, the results are encouraging. If the "proof of the pudding is in the eating," then this outcome may be encouraging correctional cuisine.

This review of two major attempts in establishing pre-release centers is not offered as a complete survey of the efforts being made in this area, but it can be considered representative of the trends and philosophy which are current. In summary, it had been known for a long time that the highest percentage of post-prison failures occurs within six months after release, with the greatest number taking place during the first sixty days. It was not until the early forties that penal and correctional administrators realized that something must be done to help inmates bridge the gap between the prison community and life in free society. There must be an opportunity for de-institutionalization, a period when an inmate can take stock of himself, reaffirm his goals, his hopes and his desires, obtain counseling, broaden his purpose and his outlook and, by so doing, enhance his chances for successful release and a happy life.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The most serious problem confronting corrections is that of recidivism, the proneness of many criminals to continue a life of crime. The general public tends to accept recidivism as total failure of correctional treatment. Society needs to be made aware of programs employed by corrections to reduce recidivism.

Much has been written about the mission to eradicate recidivism. A review of the literature, presented in Chapter II, disclosed various approaches and experimental programs designed to prepare offenders for their successful return to free society. The current innovation in corrections is a program called pre-release. Pre-release is that portion of incarceration prior to release either by discharge or parole in which an intensive and concentrated effort is made by the institution to help the prisoner bridge the gap between prison and free society. The ultimate objective of this experimental endeavor is to reduce the rate of recidivism. The concept is not new. What is new is the organized effort to establish centers or facilities within the institution which accomplish the broad objectives generally accepted.

Chapter III presents a descriptive study of pre-release by comparing and contrasting the existing programs of state and federal correctional institutions. A questionnaire was developed to secure current information on the status of pre-release. The second part of this chapter presents comments by administrators of pre-release. These include long-range plans or ideas being contemplated and criticism of

2-

individual programs. Finally, the analysis of the data to determine program effect on recidivism concludes the chapter.

I. RESPONSES FROM INSTITUTIONS

The questionnaire was sent to all state correctional institutions and various federal and foreign pententiaries. A total of 72 questionnaires was distributed. The initial mailing produced 36 replies. A second questionnaire, to all non-reporting institutions, brought an additional 11 responses. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

As seen in Table I, the total return was 47 responses. Existing programs of pre-release were reported by 29 institutions. Pre-release programs had not been established at 18 institutions and 25 questionnaires were not returned. It was assumed that institutions not responding probably have no available program of pre-release. The total response was 65 per cent and considered sufficient for a valid study.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF INSTITUTIONS WHO REPLIED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Response	State	Federal	Foreign	Total
Total Number of cases	50	16	6	72
Number who replied	32	11	4	47
Per cent who replied	64%	69%	67%	65%
Number with program	20	9	0	29
Per cent with program	40%	56%	0%	40%
Number without program	12	2	4	18
Per cent without program	24%	13%	67%	25%
Number not replying	18	5	2	25
Per cent not replying	36%	31%	33%	35%

To be effective, must the pre-release center be a separate facility? Administrators' opinions differ over the type facility required for pre-release. Although a separate facility was strongly advocated, it was generally agreed that the program could function effectively within the institution. A separate center to house pre-release was reported by 14 states. Regardless of type facility employed, the program should offer prisoners an opportunity to discuss problems and anxieties relating to his release and future social adjustment, in a non-threatening environment.

Approximately 20 states and the federal government now are making some effort to establish pre-release centers. The United States Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, in 1955, launched the pioneer program of pre-release in America. Oregon, in 1956, was the first state correctional institution to establish a program. Hawaii is the latest state to accept the pre-release concept, initiating a program in June, 1968. The correctional institutions, state and federal, with existing programs of pre-release are listed in Appendix B.

Table II shows the period of time existing programs of pre-release have been in operation. From institutions responding, the reported period of operation ranged from two months (Hawaii) to 152 months (Oregon) with a mean of 47.75 months. Appendix C lists active programs and dates established.

TABLE II

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL TIME AS OF AUGUST, 1968, IN MONTHS

Months	Frequency	Percentage
2	1	4
8	1	4
11	1	4
18	2	7
24	2	7
28	3	11
31	2	7
41	1	4
44	3	11
47	1	4
54	3	11
57	2	7
67	1	4
80	1	4
83	1	4
93	1	4
113	1	4
152	1	4
Total	28	100

Texas, with an average of 342 inmates, had the largest number of participants in pre-release. Hawaii and Wyoming, both with an average attendance of nine, were the smallest reporting programs. The average participation was 45.67 individuals per program session. Table III shows the average participation in each program.

It is not believed that pre-release programs are necessary for all releasees. To apply such programs across the board to all men would be wasteful of time and effort. Participants should be carefully selected by the staff members on the basis of individual need, potential, and expressed wish to profit from the experience. This presupposes a general program and an institutional atmosphere which motivates and encourages men toward self-improvement efforts.

The criteria used for selection of participants varied among the reporting institutions. Administrators generally agreed that pre-release preparation should begin with admission. However, time remaining on the sentence appeared to be the principal method of selection for participation. Inmates approximately 30 days to 90 days from their release date were eligible for pre-release in some institutions. Any prisoner within six months of release and applicants scheduled for the next meeting of the Board of Parole were eligible to attend in one institution. Only volunteers participated in four pre-release centers and all prisoners attend the program in eight. The Federal Guidance Center in Los Angeles accepts only the non-violent. Some centers exclude homosexuals, alcholics, narcotics, psychopaths and individuals with detainers. Table IV tabulates the responses to the question concerning selective criteria for pre-release participation.

TABLE III

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS PER PROGRAM

Number	Frequency	Percentage
9	2	7
15	3	11
21	3	11
27	3	11
33	4	14
39	6	21
51	2	7
57	3	11
63	1	4
342	1	4

TABLE IV

CRITERIA USED FOR SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS, BY YES-NO RESPONSES

Criteria	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
All inmates accepted	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
All except homosexuals	Yes	2	7
	No	26	93
All except "detainers"	Yes	9	32
	No	19	68
Volunteers	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86
Parolees only	Yes	3	11
	No	25	89
Parolees except homosexuals	Yes	1	4
	No	27	96
Parolees except "detainers"	Yes	2	7
	No	26	93
Others	Yes	6	21
	No	22	79

The questionnaire reported a variety of program designs. The length of time prisoners spent in pre-release preparation ranged from a minimum of seven days to a maximum of six months. Table V shows the length of various sessions as reported by 28 institutions.

TABLE V

AVERAGE LENGTH OF PROGRAM SESSIONS

Days	Response	Frequency	Percentage
7	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86
14	Yes	1	4
	No	27	96
21	Yes	2	7
	No	26	93
30	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
45	Yes	0	0
	No	28	100
60	Yes	5	18
	No	23	82
90	Yes	5	18
	No	23	82
Longer	Yes	3	11
	No	25	89

Responses to a question regarding the number of prisoners who had completed the pre-release program are shown in Table VI. Texas, with 9435, reported the largest number of inmates completing pre-release. An average of 892.71 releasees had completed the program as reported by 28 institutions.

TABLE VI

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE COMPLETED PROGRAM AS OF AUGUST, 1968

Completion total	Frequency	Percentage
16	10	36
165	5	18
347	2	7
529	1	4
710	3	11
1256	1	4
1437	1	4
1619	1	4
1983	1	[illegible]
2346	1	4
2710	1	4
9435	1	4

An essential principle in establishing a pre-release program is to make available information and assistance deemed pertinent in release planning. The program must be geared to the specific needs of the individual inmates. A program is not fully outlined in advance of its implementation and continues to be experimental in nature and flexible in design. Program content differed widely among the reporting institutions. A variety of subjects and services were used to supplement the schedule program. Administrators experimented with various community resources in attempts to formulate workable procedures to assist prisoners in making a successful transition to the community. Institutions reported wide use of work release, school and family furloughs as privileges used in connection with pre-release. Additional visiting, some with picnic facilities and uncensored mail were employed by some institutions. Tours and attendance at sports events were common among reporting centers. Wardrobe shopping trips to the local community were available to pre-release participants in Colorado. In nine centers, the prisoners wore civilian clothing and seven institutions allowed the participants to choose their wardrobe.

All pre-release administrators reported making use of special privileges in their program. Only a minority believed the privileges to be essential in operating a program of pre-release. Unarmed work supervisors and a relaxed atmosphere were reported by Texas.

The majority of institutions reported widespread use of additional programs in conjunction with pre-release. Such services as group counseling, driver's education and Social Security were used to supplement the regular program. The response to additional programs used in connection with pre-release are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII

RESPONSES TO USE OF ANCILLARY PROGRAMS

Programs	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Group Counseling	Yes	18	64
	No	10	36
Driver's Education	Yes	11	39
	No	17	61
Alcoholic	Yes	16	57
	No	12	43
Psychiatric	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
Social Security	Yes	15	54
	No	13	46
Narcotic	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
Others	Yes	11	39
	No	17	61

The pre-release program, to be effective, should have definite goals and objectives. All existing programs of pre-release reported having goals, although priority of purpose diverged among various institutions. The recognizable contrast appeared to be a choice between what was best for the individual or for the institution. Reorientation to the demands of society was a purpose accepted by all 28 reporting administrators. Reduced hostility toward the prison was a goal cited by six facilities. Individual problem solving was an objective reported by 25 institutions. Table VIII enumerates the total response to various program goals and objectives.

Administration of pre-release was a variable selected for investigation. The questionnaire indicates that among different institutions the program is conducted by various agencies. Correctional personnel supervised the pre-release program in 16 institutions. The responsibility of pre-release in Kansas was shared by inmates under the supervision of a vocational coordinator. Student counselors conducted the program in the Federal Guidance Center located in Kansas City, Missouri. Classification had charge of pre-release preparation in eight centers. The Parole Authority administered five programs. Table IX details responses to the question concerning administration.

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PROGRAM GOALS

Goals or Objectives	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Change in attitude	Yes	19	68
	No	9	32
General guidance	Yes	24	86
	No	4	14
Reduce prison hostility	Yes	6	21
	No	22	79
Stress Prison regulations	Yes	2	7
	No	26	93
Reorient to society's demands	Yes	28	100
	No	0	0
Evaluate individual needs	Yes	21	75
	No	7	25
Anxiety relief	Yes	15	54
	No	13	46
Counseling	Yes	25	89
	No	3	11
None established	Yes	0	0
	No	28	100
Others	Yes	6	21
	No	22	79

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TYPE OF ADMINISTRATORS

Administrator	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Correctional	Yes	16	57
	No	12	43
Parole	Yes	5	18
	No	23	82
Classification	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
Other	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86

The pre-release staff consisted of professional and non-professional personnel. The replies showed professional employees at 26 centers and custodial personnel at 12. The majority of state programs used professional staff from the institution. Federal programs had a separate staff. Table X lists the number of personnel, professional and custodial.

The staff classified as professional consisted of a variety of personnel. Supervisors and counselors were available at

TABLE X

NUMBER OF STAFF MEMBERS CLASSIFIED AS PROFESSIONAL OR CUSTODIAL

PROFESSIONAL			CUSTODIAL		
Number	Frequency	Percentage	Number	Frequency	Percentage
0.0	2	7	0.1	16	57
1.1	5	18	1.9	1	4
1.8	4	14	3.1	3	11
2.9	6	21	4.2	1	4
4.0	4	14	4.8	1	4
5.1	1	4	6.0	2	7
7.0	1	4	7.2	1	4
8.1	1	4	7.8	1	4
8.8	1	4	10.2	1	4
10.0	1	4	29.8	1	4
14.0	2	7			

Mean = 4.07

Mean = 3.10

most centers. Of the 28 reporting institutions, only four had medical supervisors. Educational employees were members of the staff at seven institutions with pre-release.

Volunteers from the community were used by 24 programs to provide instruction and conduct group discussions. The use of community and civic leaders was considered the key to many programs. Administrators generally agreed that a reduction of anxieties and fear resulted when inmates and community leaders were brought face to face. In addition to serving a beneficial purpose, better public relations were established within the community.

Additional members of the staff, as reported by the respondents, consisted of stewards, bookkeepers, secretaries, personnel officers, recreational supervisors, and institutional parole officers. An analysis of replies concerning staff membership is presented in Table XI.

The criterion used to select a pre-release staff was considered important for investigation. Respondents presented a wide variation in qualifications necessary for employee selection. Previous correctional experience was desired by 13 administrators and only four programs chose personnel within their own correctional institution. A college degree was essential for selection in 14 programs. Promotional and civil service exams were additional methods of employment. The frequency distribution of responses to criteria used in staff selection is presented in Table XII.

TABLE XI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES CONCERNING STAFF MEMBERSHIP

Staff	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Supervisor	Yes	20	71
	No	8	29
Counselor	Yes	22	79
	No	6	21
Psychologist	Yes	9	32
	No	19	68
Education	Yes	7	25
	No	21	75
Medical	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86
Employment	Yes	15	54
	No	13	46
Sociologist	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71
Case worker	Yes	15	54
	No	13	46
Chaplain	Yes	10	36
	No	18	64
Others	Yes	12	43
	No	16	57

TABLE XII

RESPONSES TO CRITERIA USED IN STAFF SELECTION

Criteria	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Correctional experience	Yes	13	46
	No	15	54
Prior military service	Yes	2	7
	No	26	93
Civil service exam	Yes	10	36
	No	18	64
Promotional exams	Yes	6	21
	No	22	79
"Pot luck"	Yes	0	0
	No	28	100
College degree	Yes	14	50
	No	14	50
Through the ranks	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86
Personal interview	Yes	10	36
	No	18	64
Probationary trial period	Yes	9	32
	No	19	68
Other	Yes	8	29
	No	20	71

II. COMMENTS FROM PRE-RELEASE ADMINISTRATORS

Pre-release administrators were invited and encouraged to make additional comments concerning the questions. A space was provided for comments expressing general criticism of the pre-release program.

A summary analysis of responses revealed the average pre-release administrator to be principally interested in program acceptance. This portion of the study presents a sampling of criticisms of pre-release, a number of which are paraphrased below.

Institutional personnel do not know the deep value of pre-release (Federal Guidance Center, Los Angeles, California).

It does not meet specific individual goals on a case-by-case basis (Iowa).

Hard to get inmates interested (McNeil Island, Washington).

Not a total rehabilitation program (Oklahoma).

Sentences too short, thus chronic alcholics do not benefit; time in program should be expanded (North Carolina).

Behavior will not change the last 20 to 30 days in confinement (Wyoming).

Small community centers are too expensive (Hawaii).

A separate facility is essential (Virginia).

Not scientific enough (Nevada).

Program is not designed with release in mind (El Reno, Oklahoma).

Lack of funds to allow follow-up on release participant (Texas).

Not enough community acceptance (Washington, D. C.).

Pre-release pampers prisoners (Florida).

The foregoing responses were received as criticism of the present program of pre-release. Pre-release programming is a part of the institution's overall correctional effort. It cannot be isolated from other treatment activities. Ideally, the thrust of institutional programming should be in the direction of release planning, commencing with admission classification. The desirability of this is quickly evidenced when a pre-release program is initiated. Almost immediately the inadequacies of conventional programs are exposed.

A space was provided for comments about long-range plans or ideas being contemplated. Only a summary of those suggestions is presented below.

Combine pre-release with work-release (Colorado).

Make post-release counseling available (Kansas).

Accept commitment directly from the courts (Federal Guidance Center, New York).

Sell the program to the community (Washington, D. C.).

Use a halfway house as an adjunct to and extension of pre-release program (Iowa).

More freedom in the wearing of civilian clothes and visits to the community (Oklahoma).

School-release for youthful offenders (North Carolina).

Many states planned to establish new or separate facilities. Increase emphasis on public relations with the local community, was a popular recommendation.

Expansion of the whole program, a move toward combining experimental concepts, increased study and observation of the existing program generally summarize the comments from respondents. Penal authorities realized the concept of pre-release was not intended as a panacea in correctional work, but rather as a logical extension of the treatment program. Administrators continue to experiment, to run risks, and to dare. The prisoner needs help in bridging the gap between prison and the free world. To turn him loose without proper preparation for what faced him, or to fail to given him guidance after he leaves is manifestly unfair.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

From a review of the literature there evolved three principles now recognized as essential in establishing a realistic program of pre-release preparation. The third principle consists of establishing a system for evaluating the program's effectiveness. A questionnaire was found to be the most feasible method of securing data for the study.

A summary analysis of responses made it clear that the average administrator is principally interested in making pre-release a workable program. A comparison of the responses provided an opportunity to examine the ongoing program of pre-release.

We do not know to what extent the post-release adjustment is the result of institutional training and experience, pre-release preparation, supervision by the parole officer, acceptance by and encouragement from the family, success in finding the right job, or any combination of a host of other variables. However, on the basis of our study, we can point up some factors which may be of value in formulating a pre-release program.

A pre-release program should provide a period of evaluation in which the experiences of the inmate, and the specialized knowledge of the staff, may be examined in a final effort to point the way to realistic solutions of the myriad problems facing the man about to be released. Results of the questionnaire manifested that 57 per cent of pre-release administrators believed that behaviors to be effected could be measured. The various programs, objectives, and goals are presented in Table VIII, as noted previously. Administrators who believed such behavior to be non-measurable offered reasonable explanations, as in the following synopsis.

> The program has not been sufficiently organized to measure anything (Oregon).
>
> Too many variables involved in pre-release (Kansas).
>
> Lack of feedback and follow-up information received from released prisoners (Alaska, McNeil Island, Washington, and Vermont).
>
> Program was too new for statistical evaluation (California and Hawaii).
>
> The only prisoners seen again are recidivists (South Carolina).
>
> We do not know how to measure the effects of pre-release (Colorado).

The response from Colorado typifies attempts to measure behavior effected by pre-release.

While no claim is made as to the efficacy of the study, it does point up the need for some rethinking as to how staff effort might bring about better release planning. To this extent it fulfills the third principle of pre-release planning: to provide a system for evaluating the effectiveness of pre-release planning procedures.

Special privileges such as extra visiting time and extra correspondence are welcomed, but are by no means essential to an effective pre-release program. Some administrators believe that separate or special housing should be provided for pre-release inmates, but that such facilities are not integral for establishing the agenda.

The norms administrators used to measure success of their programs varied. Reduced recidivism, reported by 19, was the most popular yardstick. Pre-release completion justified its continuance in six institutions, and eight directors considered release as an efficient goal. One center regarded the program auspicious because of its economy. Table XIII shows responses to criteria for program success.

Society delegates to correctional institutions the responsibility to contain and create change in convicted offenders. Success or failure of the institution to perform its duties effectively has been reflected by recidivism rates. A total failure of correctional treatment, as viewed by society, occurs when the released prisoner returns to confinement. However, society does not attribute success in the community to an effective treatment program. Since recidivism rates are used to judge success or failure of corrections, the questionnaire was designed to collect data for comparison.

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO CRITERIA USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM SUCCESS

Criteria	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Recidivism rate	Yes	19	68
	No	9	32
Family unity	Yes	4	14
	No	24	86
Program completion	Yes	6	21
	No	22	79
Economical to institution	Yes	1	4
	No	27	96
Employment placement	Yes	7	25
	No	21	75
Release	Yes	8	21
	No	20	79
Other	Yes	7	25
	No	21	75

The use of recidivism rates to measure the effectiveness of pre-release was generally reported by respondents. However, administrators were reluctant to reveal statistics on recidivism for their particular correctional systems. Of the 28 respondents, 14 administrators did not include recidivism rates prior to initiating programs of pre-release.

Responses from administrators quoting their individual statistics produced a wide spectrum of recidivism results. North Carolina indicated the lowest return rate of 11 per cent prior to establishing pre-release. However, the figures were from a one-year study, which is considered an insufficient length of time. An average of 41.6 per cent recidivism was computed from prisons reporting their statistics prior to initiating pre-release. The average figure, although very high, was somewhat lower than that anticipated before the research.

Of these 28 with existing programs of pre-release, 12 directors gave recidivism statistics after launching their programs. Even though several programs have only been established recently, and their findings are meager, the overall average showed a significant reduction in released offenders returning to confinement. Table XIV shows the frequency distribution relative to recidivism before and after pre-release was introduced.

A comparative study of reduction in recidivism incidence as reported by individual institutions is presented in Table XV. Florida, after operating pre-release for four years, cited a reduction of 40 per cent in recidivism. Virginia, after two years with pre-release, showed a reduction of 26 per cent. The Federal Guidance Center in New York reported a decline of 32 per cent. This latter program, however, was only established in January, 1968; and a recidivism rate of 28 per cent, after seven months of operation, must be considered extremely high.

More realistic figures are presented by mailings from Colorado, Texas, and the Federal Guidance Center, Los Angeles, California. Colorado, after 114 months of supervising pre-release reflects a recidivism reduction of 13 per cent.

TABLE XIV

RECIDIVISM RATES PRIOR TO PRE-RELEASE AND AFTER PRE-RELEASE ESTABLISHED

BEFORE PRE-RELEASE			AFTER PRE-RELEASE		
Return Rate%	Frequency	Percentage	Return Rate%	Frequency	Percentage
No reply	14	50	No reply	16	57
16.1	1	4	4.5	1	4
22.9	1	4	5.8	1	4
32.0	2	7	7.1	1	4
34.2	2	7	10.8	1	4
41.0	1	4	12.1	1	4
43.3	1	4	13.3	1	4
45.5	1	4	14.6	1	4
47.8	1	4	28.4	1	4
50.0	2	7	29.6	2	7
59.1	1	4	30.9	1	4
65.9	1	4	44.7	1	4
Mean recidivism for 14 institutions = 41.62%			Mean recidivism for 12 institutions = 18.35%		

TABLE XV

INSTITUTIONS REPORTING REDUCTION IN RECIDIVISM AFTER ESTABLISHING PRE-RELEASE

Institution	Percentage prior pre-release	Percentage after pre-release	Per cent reduction
Florida	45	5	40
Federal, New York	60	28	32
Virginia	33	7	26
South Carolina	35	11	24
Federal, Los Angeles	50	30	20
Texas	33	14	19
Colorado	44	31	13
Georgia	35	30	5
North Carolina*	11	5	6
Oklahoma**	50	6	44

*Figures reported are from a one-year study.

**Figures submitted after one year in operation.

After five years, Texas observed a decline of 19 per cent. The Federal Guidance Center at Los Angeles noted a reduction of 20 per cent after seven years of maintaining pre-release.

Administrators were asked to evaluate through their answers the effectiveness of their existing program of pre-release. Of the 28 respondents, 17 believed their program to be successful, ten did not know the effect, and one wrote that the program failed to be effective (Oregon). Table XVI records the reactions to program evaluation.

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
TO INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluation	Frequency	Percentage
Successful	17	60
Don't know	10	36
Failure	1	4
Total	28	100

Society tends to employ recidivism rates as an indicator of the effectiveness of corrections. This society, however, only looks at one side of the coin. Total failure of treatment is reflected when the released offender returns to confinement. Yet, if the offender remains in the community, this is not necessarily attributed to correctional effectiveness. The general public may assume that the offender was rehabilitated in spite of the program.

But what agency was responsible for the initial failure--the community, or the individual? Society says the individual failed to adjust and accept behaviors and standards conducive to free living. The offender blames his fate on environment, poor education, lack of employment. The correctional institution has no choice: its inmate population consists of "failures," regardless of cause. Corrections tends to consider progress in the individual the result of its program. If the offender, already classified as a failure, relapses after release, has an additional failure occurred? Society says yes, and blames ineffective correctional efforts; the individual says yes, and accuses both society and corrections; while corrections says we don't know but we intend to find out.

If recidivism is society's only criterion for the effectiveness of treatment programs, then the research reflects failure. However, if reduced recidivism rates demonstrates some degree of success, then society and corrections are making progress. The summary and conclusions of the study have been presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this study to review the existing programs of pre-release in order to determine the effectiveness of program design and content in terms of reduced recidivism rates. The concept of pre-release is presented in the summary.

The most serious problem confronting corrections today is that of recidivism. A recidivist may be defined as a person who, having been convicted and subjected to correctional treatment, upon release commits a new crime and returns to confinement. Recidivism rates are generally cited by society as evidence of the failure of institutionalized treatment. It is generally recognized that many recidivists come to grief merely because they were not adequately prepared by the institution to face a free and normal society. Penal and correctional authorities began to experiment with various methods to assist the prisoner in making a successful transition to the free community. One experimental concept developed was a program called "pre-release."

Pre-release is that portion of incarceration preceding release, either by discharge or parole, in which an intensive and concentrated effort is made by the institution to help the prisoner prepare for the release. A review of the literature revealed that the concept of pre-release is not new. Its originality consists in the organized effort to establish centers or places within the institution which accomplish its broad objectives.

Since new programs have a considerable impact on the correctional organization in which they occur, research was needed to explore and identify what the effects would be, so that change could be managed more efficiently. Correctional workers themselves were in need of more enlightenment on the subject of pre-release. In addition, society needed to be made aware of its part in the creation and perpetuation of some of the basic causes of recidivism, and of the great cost to itself resulting from neglect of the problem.

The following methods were used to obtain data for the study: (1) a review of the published materials available through library resources, including books, articles, related papers presented in professional journals, and the reports of various conferences and committees on pre-release; (2) correspondence with administrators of existing programs of pre-release; (3) material received from recognized authorities in the field of penology; (4) information secured by a questionnaire distributed to all state correctional institutions and various federal and foreign prisons; (5) the writer's professional experience with a pre-release program while working as educational director at the Ferguson Unit, Texas Department of Corrections, since November, 1965.

To provide a background for the study, the historical development of reform and the era of experimentation by correctional institutions was presented. The study recognized Alexander Maconochie and the introduction of his mark system as being the start of correctional reform. Maconochie gave prisoners the opportunity to reduce their sentences by providing a system of individual responsibility.

Sir Walter Crofton, of the Irish penal system, established an administration which attracted the attention of correctional authorities throughout the world. In the development of his program, Crofton utilized the mark system of Maconochie and founded the intermediate prison. The purpose of the intermediate prison was to determine whether the prisoner had reformed and to train him for full freedom by the enjoyment of partial freedom as a preliminary step. Each prisoner had to pass the test of the intermediate prison before he could secure his ticket-of-leave.

Knowledge of Crofton's system attracted the attention of American penologist, and interest in reform was born. During the next century, various attempts were made to establish prisons as reformatories, educational institutions, and finally as great industrial centers. Private enterprise caused the fall of the industrial prison and plunged correctional administrators into a search for new methods of employing institutional treatment. This quest continues today. Perhaps the most important development during this period was the initiation of community treatment programs of probation and parole. These services provided an alternative to confinement and an opportunity to confront the individual's problems in the environment where eventually almost all offenders must succeed or fail.

Corrections today display evidence of a number of evolutions in thought and practice, each seeking to cope with the difficult problems of punishing, deterring, and rehabilitating offenders. It seems inevitable that the changes now occurring will be associated with public concern over the problems of crime, criminals, corrections, and growing insistence on results. The concepts are not new; their emphasis is.

A perplexing situation in the treatment of prison inmates occurs when men are under custodial supervision in the prison one day and leave this supervision for comparative freedom on the next day. Correctional authorities recognized that the prisoner needs help in bridging the gap between confinement and the free community. To turn him loose without proper preparation for what faces him, or to fail to guide him after he leaves, is obviously unfair. Society delegates to correctional institutions the obligation and responsibility to create and design programs for preparing the offender for his reentry into the community.

Work release is a program under which inmates of correctional institutions may be employed in nearby communities during the day and return to the prison at night. This procedure is not a substitute for probation or parole. Nor is it a compulsory means of offsetting the cost of public welfare payments to dependent families. It is intended to be a judicious resource for the treatment of certain offenders.

One provision of the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 gave the Attorney General authority to grant furloughs. From a correctional standpoint, one of the most compelling reasons for granting furloughs is to reinforce family ties. While substantial investments in offenders were being made, little or no work was being done with offenders' families. The timely and prudent use of home furloughs can do much to alleviate the imbalance.

Halfway houses have been in the experimental stages for almost fifty years, but it is in recent years that they have received more widespread support. Halfway houses are facilities established within the community to ease the transition to free society, usually operated by a civic group or agency apart from the correctional institution. Research has shown that halfway houses do help some individuals adjust to society and normal living. The halfway house offers an additional weapon in the arsenal of rehabilitation.

The open institution is characterized by the absence of walls and the substitution of psychological controls for physical barriers against escape. Authorities strive to make conditions within the institution resemble life in the free community as much as possible. The more permissive atmosphere is intended to be more appropriate for therapy. The open institution is more economical to construct and operate than the closed prison. A major goal of the open institution is to create an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of the individual and to provide maximum opportunity for positive behavioral change.

It has been known for a long time that the highest percentage of post-release failures occur within six months after release, and that the greatest number of these take place within the first sixty days. But it was not until recently that penal and correctional authorities realized that something must be done to help prisoners bridge the gap between penitentiary and freedom. The pre-release program is an experiment designed to prepare the offender for his return to society. The significant findings and analyses of data, secured from all methods of research, are listed in the conclusions.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The evidence presented in this study indicates that the following conclusions appear to be in order:

1. Pre-release preparation should begin as early as possible in the sentence and unless this is done any last minute efforts are only wasteful of time and energy. Inmates must be told in advance of the purpose and intention of the pre-release program. The concept of pre-release must be accepted by the population, and the best method to sell the program is by means of the inmates themselves.

2. Staff members should not be allowed to seduce inmates to participate by use of special privileges. The best insurance is to have a sound program, which will stand on its own merits.

3. The program should be organized with realistic goals and objectives in mind. The program must be formulated as a portion of the

total treatment process rather than a panacea which will eradicate recidivism.

4. The counseling program should be geared toward dealing with the immediate problems of adjustment instead of attempting any underlying personality change. This would seem to be well-founded because of the limited period of time available. Personality change efforts should come earlier in the treatment program, and pre-release counseling should in reality be the "icing on the cake."

5. Participants should be carefully selected by the staff on the basis of individual need, potential, and expressed desire to profit from the experience. What is important here is that the participants in pre-release should not be chosen according to some predetermined arbitrary standards. In this case, the temptation appears to be too great to pick only those who seem to have the best opportunity of adjusting satisfactorily in free society. This may promote favorable statistics but does not necessarily guarantee a good program.

6. The position an employee occupies has no bearing on how well he will be qualified to handle a pre-release program. Those staff members who by inclination and demonstration are obviously the most capable are the ones we must select to carry out this last phase of the correctional effort.

7. Relationships between the staff and the inmates should be more on the basis of employee-employer than custodian-inmate.

8. Every effort should be made to enlist the support and participation of the community. This not only provides reassurance to the inmates that the community will accept him on the basis of his present behavior, but also assists the community in understanding the problems and dilemmas facing the releasee.

9. The program should provide practical services which will enable the releasee to devote his time to dealing with more than petty problems. This should include driver's training, clearance of Social Security records, assistance with legal problems, and issuing of appropriate identification for use upon release.

10. A major effort should be put forth by the pre-release officials, encouraging increased family contact through visitation, correspondence, and counseling.

11. Whenever physically and geographically possible, it would seem appropriate to incorporate some form of work-release activity.

12. The center itself should be minimum security and should encourage personal responsibilities.

13. Most administrators believed that the inmates benefit from pre-release preparation, but recognized that prisoners still under supervision might be reluctant to say anything critical of the program.

14. Some administrators advocated the use of separate facilities to house the pre-release program and did not believe a program could exist within the institutional framework. If we have an institution that is so repressive that a separate facility is necessary for pre-release, then we

should take a look at the institution we are operating. There is something wrong.

15. Pre-release preparation is effective in reducing recidivism. All respondents to the questionnaire disclosed a reduction in recidivism rates after initiating pre-release.

16. If pre-release programs are to be made a part of the treatment process, there should be some provision for determining its effectiveness. There appears to be a wide variance in criteria used to measure pre-release effects. Recidivism rates are used by society to evaluate the success or failure of institutions to correct. If recidivism rates are the single criterion used to evaluate pre-release, then the program is effective.

17. America's correctional system is overcrowded and overworked, undermanned, underfinanced, and very often misunderstood. It needs more information and more wisdom. It needs more technical resources. It needs more coordination among its many parts. It needs more public support. It needs the help of community programs and institutions in dealing with offenders and potential offenders. It needs, above all, the willingness to re-examine old ways of doing things, to reform itself, to experiment, run risks, to dare. It needs vision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. AUTHORITIES

Barnes, Harry E. and Negley K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall., 1959.

Eaton, Joseph W. Stone Walls not a Prison Make. Springfield: C. C. Thomas Company, 1962.

Galtung, Johan. "Prison: The Organization of Dilemma," in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Gillen, John. Taming the Criminal. New York: Macmillan Company, 1931.

Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1964.

Grunhut, Max. Penal Reform. New York: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Whitehead, Leo. Southmore House. Houston: Hearne Lithographing Company, 1967.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Adams, Stuart. "Interaction Between Individual Interview Therapy and Treatment Amenability in Older Youth Authority Wards." Monograph No. 2, Sacramento: Department of Corrections (July, 1961).

American Correctional Association. Manual of Correctional Standards. New York: The American Correctional Association, 1962.

Armstrong, Dixie. An Established Pre-Release Program. Speeches Delivered at the Twenty-Second Meeting, Southern States Prison Association. New Orleans, April 12-15, 1964.

Bennett, James V. Federal Prisons, 1948. A Report of the Work of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Board of Pardons and Paroles. The Handbook on Parole and Executive Clemency in Texas. Austin: State Printing Office, 1967.

California Adult Authority. *Principles, Policies, and Programs*. Sacramento: Department of Corrections, 1952.

Carney, Francis J. "An Analysis of Recidivism among Inmates Released From Forestry Camps." *Publication No. 630*. Massachusetts Department of Corrections, 1967.

Colorado Department of Institutions. *Pre-Parole Release Manual*. Canon City: Department of Institutions (March, 1967).

Correctional Research Association: *Community Work: An Alternative to Imprisonment*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Hall, Reis H. A *Descriptive and Comparative Study of Recidivism in Pre-Release Guidance Center Releasees* United States Department of Justice. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Manley, Harry. *Shaw Residence*. Speeches Delivered at the Twenty-Third Meeting. Southern States Prison Association. Richmond, June 6, 1965.

National Conference on Pre-Release. A Symposium on Adult Offender Programs. *Proceedings of a Conference*. November 1-4. Huntsville: Department of Corrections, 1967.

National Probation Association. *John Augustus, First Probation Officer*, New York (1939).

Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex. *Pre-Parole Manual*. Lincoln: Department of Corrections, 1966.

Task Force Report. *Corrections*. A Report Prepared by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Texas Department of Corrections. *Annual Report*. Huntsville: Department of Corrections, 1966.

_____. *Pre-Release Manual* Huntsville: Department of Corrections, 1963.

The American Prison Association. *Handbook on Pre-Release Preparation in Correctional Institutions*. New York: The American Prison Association, 1950.

The Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedure. *Probation*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939.

United States Civil Service Commission. New Horizons for Selective Placement: The Rehabilitated Offender. A Conference Synopsis. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons. Project Design, Pre-Release Guidance Centers. Washington: Government Printing Office (September, 1965).

United States Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. Pre-Release Progress and Problems. Washington: Government Printing Office (October, 1957).

United States Penitentiary, Marion, Illinois. Pre-Release Program. Washington: Government Printing Office (June, 1964).

Walnut Correctional Center. Pre-Release Manual. Madison: Wisconsin Correctional System (April, 1967).

Washington Correctional Center. Pre-Release Manual. Shelton: Washington Department of Corrections (October, 1967).

C. PERIODICALS

Baker, J. E. "Preparing Prisoners for Their Return to the Community," Federal Probation (June, 1966).

Banay, Ralph S. "Should Prisons Be Abolished?", New York Times Magazine (June 30, 1955).

Barry, John V. "Alexander Maconochie," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science (July-August, 1956).

Bean, W. J. "How a Federal Institution Prepared Its Prisoners for Return to Society," Federal Probation (December, 1953).

Beck, C. J. "A Reconsideration of Labels in Penology," A Review of General Semantics (Autumn, 1959).

Bennett, James V. "Evaluating a Prison," Annals 293 (May, 1954).

Bradley, R. L. "The English Borstal System after the War," Federal Probation (December, 1948).

Catalino, Anthony. "A Pre-Release Program for Juveniles in a Medium Security Institution," Federal Probation (December, 1967).

Clark, Jesse E. "The Texas Pre-Release Program," American Jounral of Correction (March-April, 1967).

_____. "The Texas Pre-Release Program," Federal Probation (December, 1966).

Couse, A. K. "Pre-Release Preparation for Parole," *The Canadian Journal of Corrections* (July, 1965).

Cressey, Donald R. "Achievements of an Unstated Organizational Tool: An Observation on Prisons," *Pacific Sociological Review* (Fall, 1948).

Crosswhite, R. G. "Bridging the Gap from Confinement to Freedom," *Federal Probation* (June, 1959).

Eriksson, Torsten. "Post-War Reform in Sweden," *Annals 293* (May, 1954).

Fenton, Norman. "The Psychological Preparation of Inmates for Release," *Prison World* (November-December, 1949).

Garrett, Willie. "Bridging the Gap," *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 1965.

Grupp, Stanley E. "Work Release in the United States," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* (September, 1963).

Harrison, Gus. "New Concepts in Release Procedures," *Proceedings*. American Correctional Association, 1953.

Jansyn, Leon R. "Problems and Counseling in Pre-Release," *Prison Journal*, 1966.

Kehrberg, John H. "Halfway Houses . . . Good or Bad?", *American Journal of Correction* (January-February, 1968).

Long, Edward V. "The Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965," *Federal Probation* (December, 1965).

McCorkle, Lloyd W. "Resocialization Within Walls," *Annals 293* (May, 1954).

Meiner, Robert G. "A Halfway House for Parolees," *Federal Probation* (June, 1965).

Morris, Norval. "Prisons in Evolution," *Federal Probation* (December, 1965).

Murray, Edward B. "The Role of the Probation Officer in Pre-Release Preparation," *Federal Probation* (December, 1963).

Powell, Robert W. "Punishment Reconsidered," *American Journal of Correction* (March-April, 1968).

Richmond, Mark S. "On Conquering Prison Walls," Federal Probation (June, 1966).

Rubin, Sol. "Recidivism and Recidivism Statistics," National Probation and Parole Association Journal (July, 1958).

Shelby, Joseph. "Daytop Lodge: Halfway Houses for Drug Addicts," Federal Probation (December, 1957).

Vander Weil, Ronald W. "Pre-Release Programs and Pennsylvania," Prison Journal, 1966.

Vedders, Clyde B. "Counter Forces in Prison-Inmate Therapy," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science (November-December, 1954).

Vold, George B. "Does the Prison Reform?", Annals 293 (May, 1954).

Wright, John C. "Curiosity and Opportunism," Trans-Action (January-February, 1965).

APPENDIX A

PRE-RELEASE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is the pre-release center a separate facility?

   ( ) Yes ( ) No

2. When was your program started?____________________________
   Day Month Year

3. Average number of participants per program.____________________

4. Total number completed program to date_________________________

5. What criteria used for selection of participants?

   ( ) All
   ( ) All except homosexuals
   ( ) All except detainees
   ( ) Volunteers
   ( ) Parolees only
   ( ) Parolees not homosexuals
   ( ) Parolees not detainees
   ( ) Others

   If other, please explain____________________________________

6. Average period of time spent in program.

   ( ) 7 days
   ( ) 14 days
   ( ) 21 days
   ( ) 30 days
   ( ) 45 days
   ( ) 60 days
   ( ) 90 days
   ( ) Longer

7. Who administers your program?

   ( ) Correctional
   ( ) Parole
   ( ) Classification
   ( ) Other (explain)____

8. The staff consists of:

Professional (number) ______

Custodial (number) ______

9. The following are included on the staff.

( ) Supervisor
( ) Counselor
( ) Psychologist
( ) Education
( ) Medical
( ) Employment placement
( ) Sociologist
( ) Case-worker
( ) Recreation
( ) Chaplain
( ) Other (list)____

____

10. Define goals of your program.

( ) Attitude change
( ) Guidance
( ) Reduce hostility toward prison
( ) Stress prison rules and regulations
( ) Evaluate individual needs
( ) Anxiety relief
( ) Counseling
( ) None established
( ) Other (explain)____

11. Do community and civic leaders participate?

( ) Yes ( ) No

12. Type clothing worn in program:

( ) Institutional

( ) Civilian

( ) Both

13. In addition to established program, what "sub" programs are involved?

( ) Group counseling

( ) Driver education

( ) Alcoholic

( ) Psychiatric

( ) Social Security

( ) Narcotic

( ) Other (list)____

____

14. What criteria used to evaluate success or failure of your program?

( ) Recidivism rate

( ) Family unity

( ) Program completion

( ) Economical to prison

( ) Employment placement

( ) Release

( ) Other____

____

15. Would you define program success as:

( ) No future arrests

( ) Less than two misdemeanors

( ) Less than five misdemeanors

( ) No more than one conviction

( ) Other (explain)_____________________________________

____

16. Recidivism rate prior to a program of pre-release?

____

17. Recidivism rate after pre-release?

____

18. What are the criteria used in the selection of professionals and non-professionals who staff the program?

( ) Correctional experience
( ) Prior military service
( ) Civil service exam
( ) Promotional exam
( ) College degree
( ) Through the ranks
( ) Personal interview
( ) Probation trial period
( ) Other (explain)________________________

____

19. Are the behaviors to be effected by the program actually measurable?

( ) Yes - How?________________________

____

( ) No - Why?________________________

____

20. What is your annual pre-release budget?

____

21. If a cost-benefits analysis of your program is available, please explain.

____

____

22. How would you rate your present program?

( ) Successful

( ) Don't Know

( ) Failure

23. List your general criticism of pre-release.

____

____

____

24. What long-range plans or ideas are being contemplated?

____

____

____

25. Any additional comments are welcome.

____

____

____

____________ ____________________________

Date SIGNATURE AND TITLE

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONS WITH PRE-RELEASE, AUGUST, 1968

State

Alaska
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Iowa
Kansas
Nebraska
Nevada
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Carolina
Texas
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
Wyoming

Federal

United States Penitentiary, Marion, Illinois
United States Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Washington
Federal Reformatory, El Reno, Oklahoma
Federal Guidance Center, Los Angeles, California
Federal Guidance Center, Chicago, Illinois
Federal Guidance Center, Detroit, Michigan
Federal Guidance Center, Kansas City, Missouri
Federal Guidance Center, New York, New York
Federal Guidance Center, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX C

ESTABLISHED DATES OF PRE-RELEASE

State	Date
Oregon	January, 1956
Colorado	February, 1959
Vermont	November, 1960
Texas	September, 1963
Kansas	November, 1963
Florida	January, 1964
South Carolina	January, 1964
Connecticut	January, 1965
Georgia	January, 1965
Iowa	January, 1965
Washington	April, 1965
North Carolina	February, 1966
Nevada	April, 1966
Wyoming	May, 1966
Alaska	July, 1966
Virginia	July, 1966
Oklahoma	January, 1967
California	August, 1967
Hawaii	June, 1968
Nebraska (revised)	August, 1968

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONS WITHOUT PRE-RELEASE, AUGUST, 1968

States

Alabama

Arizona

Arkansas

Indiana

Louisiana

Maine

Missouri

Montana

New Hampshire

New Jersey

Tennesseee

West Virginia

Federal

Federal Reformatory, Lompoc, California

Federal Reformatory, Petersburg, Virginia

Foreign

Alberta, Canada

Canal Zone

Ottawa, Canada

Puerto Rico

APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONS NOT REPLYING, AUGUST, 1968

States

Delaware
Idaho
Illinois
Kentucky
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
New Mexico
New York
North Dakota
Ohio
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Dakota
Utah
Wisconsin

Federal

United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia
United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas
United States Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania
United States Penitentiary, Terre Haute, Indiana
Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio

Foreign

Virgin Islands
London, England